# THE DUBLIN REVIEW

Founded by Nicholas Wiseman and others in 1836

LONDON: THE TABLET PUBLISHING COMPANY LTD.

NUMBER 476 SUMMER 1958

Price 6s., plus postage : Subscription 25s. per annum, post free : U.S.A. \$4

## CONTENTS

Editorial	20		9
Catholic Higher Education: Our Present Problem By the Bishop of Salford			10
The Catholic Student and Philosophy By D. J. B. Hawkins	1		10
Where are the Sacred Sciences? By the Abbot of Downside	ut neut	G G	11.
The Need for Catholic Historical Scholarship.  By David Knowles	i.v ji		12:
The Natural Sciences:			
I: In Catholic Higher Education	den e	doll' A ri	129
II: In General Education	state for	C se	13
Technology: Some Thoughts on its Place in Society By Jan Sikorski	BERTS	Salle Control	133
Catholics and the Study of Medicine	iner o d	7.0	139
Catholics in the Social Sciences	Contract	BELL'S	146
School to University: Problems in Sixth-Form Train By Morgan V. Sweeney	ning	100	151
The Training of Catholic Teachers By A. C. F. Beales	18 m	dyr	158

A Letter from Ireland By J. G. McGarry	M.	H	U	1	d		165
Belloc's Letters	r normali Petientu Dista	1 3 al.	AND AND	A LI	10 100	CON STATE	169
Books Reviewed:							
The Meeting of Love and Know	ledge. Ma	rk Dou	ighty				175
W. B. Yeats and Tradition.	Letters of	James	Joyce.	Chri	stopl	her	
Busby	0.37	X 15					178
Richard Crashaw. F. N. Lees .	The second	10.75					183
The Road to Santiago, The Cat	hedrals of	Spain.	Denis	Brass			186
The Catholic Emancipation Crist						ell	189

THE DUBLIN REVIEW is published quarterly, at the end of March, June, September and December.

All articles are copyright throughout the world, and may not be reproduced without the express permission of the Editor.

All communications, articles and books for review should be addressed to The Dublin Review, 128 Sloane Street, London, S.W.I.

Articles can only be received on the understanding that publication alone is a guarantee of acceptance and payment.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW is regularly analysed for the International Index to Periodicals (H. W. Wilson & Co., New York).

Notice to American subscribers: THE DUBLIN REVIEW has entered into an agreement with University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, to make THE DUBLIN REVIEW available to libraries in microfilm form. Sales are restricted to those subscribing to the paper edition, and the film copy is only distributed at the end of the volume year. Inquiries concerning purchase should be directed to University Microfilm, 313 N. First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.

Nihil obstat: Hubertus Richards, S.T.L., L.S.S. Censor Deputatus.

Imprimatur: A Georgius L. Craven, Episcopus Sebastopolis, Vic. Gen.

Westmonasterii, die 28a Maii 1958.

## Editorial

THIS is not a 'specialized' number of THE DUBLIN REVIEW, but, by distinction, an integrated one. Its purpose is to illuminate one central problem in many converging spotlights: and the central problem is no less than that of the higher education of Catholics in this country. It is a problem that will be exhaustively discussed at a conference which is to meet at Strawberry Hill in September, when many of the contributors to these pages will be among the participants; and it is hoped that this number of THE DUBLIN REVIEW may serve as an introduction to that conference for those who will be attending it, as well as bringing its immensely important subject before the attention of those who will not. The conference will, we believe, be the first of its kind; the Archbishop of Westminster will preside on the opening day, and the Bishop of Salford, who here contributes an introductory essay, will deliver an opening address.

The initiative for this conference came from a group of Catholic university professors and lecturers in England and Wales; and we cannot here describe their intentions better than by quoting from the letter of invitation sent to those who attended a preparatory gathering at Strawberry Hill in the summer of last year:

n

al

to

to

The expansion of the universities since the war has seen a considerable increase in the number not only of Catholic students but also of the Catholic members of the teaching staffs. The university chaplains meet together annually to discuss questions of policy and the difficulties they face, but no attempt has yet been made to arrange a general meeting of Catholic professors and lecturers, who are directly concerned with the various questions raised by the changing pattern of Catholic life in Great Britain. In the belief that it is desirable for Catholic professors and lecturers to establish and maintain some contact among themselves, and that much profit could be derived from discussions in which they participated as a body, we have thought that the time is perhaps ripe for the holding of a conference on 'The Higher Education of Catholics', to be attended by university teachers, chaplains, and such members of the clergy as would be directly interested in the subject through their work in seminaries, training colleges, etc. . . .

The theme proposed is a wide one, comprising such subjects as the place of theology and philosophy in the education of a layman, the relation of Catholic philosophy to science, the desirability of Vol. 232. No. 476. closer contacts between seminaries and universities, the effect on Catholics of the intellectual environment of modern universities, and so on. . . .

Since that letter was written the term 'higher education' has been conceived by the promoters more widely still, as the range of the papers here presented shows. Whether the conference will lead to any tangible, minimum organization being set up, whereby Catholic university teachers could maintain at least intermittent general contact for the exchange of ideas and assistance in an apostolate which concerns them all, irrespective of professional specializations, we cannot tell. But the present papers may serve to stimulate the discussions that will in any case arise; and for those readers who are not university teachers and therefore may feel no immediate concern with the conference, these pages will still have their value, we venture to think, as a cross-section survey, by writers well qualified to speak, of the problems of Catholic higher education in this country as they appear midway

through the twentieth century.

In the autumn number of THE DUBLIN REVIEW, to appear at the end of September, we shall publish a full study of the relations between Church and State in Modern Italy, as they appear after the elections that took place on Whit Sunday, and when the passage of a few months has made it easier to assess the real significance in this regard of the trial of the Bishop of Prato. This will be contributed by Mr E. E. Y. Hales, whose new book, The Catholic Church in the Modern World, is to be published in London in the autumn. Well known for his book about Pius IX, Mr Hales is an authority on the Church in Italy. The paper on which he is at present engaged for this REVIEW is intended to be the first of a series of studies in which specialists will examine in these pages the relations of Church and State in various countries of the free world as they have developed since the end of the Second World War. In the Winter number Mr Frank MacMillan will write about France, looking back on the chapter in French history which began with the Liberation in 1944 and may be said to have ended when General de Gaulle formed his Government on June 1 this year, and summing up the relationship of Church and State in those fourteen years of the Fourth Republic. Meanwhile, a 'Letter from Paris' in the Autumn number will speak of the dramatic events of this Spring and Summer not from a political point of view but as they appear to a non-political observer.

## CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

## Our Present Problem

## By THE BISHOP OF SALFORD

THE problem of Catholic higher education has been with us, in varying forms, ever since the re-establishment of the Hierarchy. Basically it is a simple problem which can be put in simple terms. Education should be a unified whole. Its centre and its summit are truth, and particularly the truth of God's revelation. Theology is the queen of the sciences. There can be no real education unless it is a Catholic education. For this purpose the ideal would be a Catholic university, enabling Catholics to achieve full intellectual development. It is unnecessary to do more than refer to Newman's ideal, expressed in the combination of 'dogmatic teaching and liberal education'. 'I want,' said Newman in 1856, 'the intellectual layman to be religious and the devout ecclesiastic to be intellectual.'

'I say, then,' Newman wrote in his Second Discourse on University Teaching, 'that if a University be, from the nature of the case, a place of instruction, where universal knowledge is professed, and if in a certain University, so called, the subject of Religion is excluded, one of two conclusions is inevitable—either, on the one hand, that the province of Religion is very barren of real knowledge, or, on the other hand, that in such University one special and important branch of knowledge is omitted. I say, the advocate of such an institution must say this, or he must say that; he must own, either that little or nothing is known about the Supreme Being, or that his seat of learning calls itself what it is not.'

In the chapter on 'Catholics and the Universities', which he contributed to *The English Catholics* 1850-1950, Mr Evennett has traced the history of the discussions and controversies which arose from the prohibition imposed by Propaganda on attendance by Catholics at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and how

the ban was eventually lifted by Pope Leo XIII in 1895. He has also given some account of the ill-fated experiment of a Catholic University College at Kensington. Mgr Philip Hughes, in an article published in The Dublin Review in 1939, has emphasized the important point that the problem presented to the Bishops in the latter half of the nineteenth century was a limited one, not only because of the structure of the Catholic community but also because of the facilities which were generally afforded in this country for a university education. The universities were open to 'the sons of gentlemen', who were a small minority in the Catholic community and who were concerned mainly with the social advantages which could be obtained only at Oxford or Cambridge. 'In truth,' as Manning put it in 1888, 'nobody cared for higher studies. Certain Catholic parents wished to get their sons into English Society and to have latchkeys to Grosvenor Square.'

Today the problem is no longer the question of making provision for a handful of Catholic gentlemen's sons chiefly for social

advantage. Mgr Hughes wrote in 1939:

There is question now of the religious education of hundreds and thousands of Catholics of every social rank, the future Catholic physicians and surgeons, lawyers, civil servants, engineers, scientific technicians of various sorts, our future schoolmasters, and schoolmistresses, and, among these last, those nuns to whom the Church must chiefly look for the Catholic formation of the armies of girls enrolled in the 400 convent schools of this country. And the problem of the religious education of Catholics in the English Universities today, what form does it take? A double form it seems. There is first, the inevitable problem of the effect on the mind and character of an educational system which, far from being built around the knowledge of truths divinely revealed, is conducted as though those truths had no existence. And, secondly, there is the problem of the effect on the mind and character of a system which, while it offers to a young man knowledge in secular matters commensurate with his maturity, leaves him, in matters of revealed truth, with the intellectual formation of a boy.

This, indeed, is becoming more obviously the core of our problem. In a *Tablet* article in May 1943, Dom Barnabas Sandeman set it out most cogently when he said that:

no solid and self-possessed Catholic public opinion has yet shown itself on all those questions of manners and of culture where the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See 'A Chronic Problem of Catholic Education,' The Dublin Review, July 1939, p. 90.

Church gives no positive guidance of approval or condemnation and where the attitude we take up is of such enormous importance to ourselves and to others. The application of Catholic principles to the manners of our times has yet to be worked out; the resistance of our ancient and universal traditions to the general decline is not as strong or as confident as one might expect, and one wonders why this is so.

He is critical of the education which is given in our public schools, showing how little it has really fused the elements of Catholic intellectualism with the requirements of the universities.

For though religion itself is conscientiously taught, and though many very ingenious attempts have been made to provide something more sympathetic in other studies, by devising special courses in Catholic sociology or periods of literature, and persuading public bodies to accept them as matter for their examinations, it remains true that the whole plan and spirit of the education given is dictated by the Universities, and that this spirit is irreligious and sometimes positively anti-Catholic. The Faith is no longer a principle which illumines and explains all else, but remains as a separate growth, developing pari passu in favourable circumstances with the liberal culture given at the same time. But too often it fails to develop as strongly and quickly as its rival; it is overshadowed, dwarfed and finally choked by a pagan culture, unable to bear the application of critical methods familiar in other subjects; or if it lives, it is only as a childish piety retained with fierce but often irrational loyalty, maintained by the grace of God, but utterly unintegrated with the Whiggish history, literary fastidiousness or scientific materialism with which it lives in uneasy and unstable tension.

This is really the heart of our problem—'the childish piety retained with fierce but often irrational loyalty, maintained by the grace of God, but utterly unintegrated. . . .' To what extent this loyalty can stand up to the erosive influence of university life must be a matter of conjecture, but there can be little doubt that the temptation to scepticism, or, even worse, to a sort of averroist acceptance of double truth, is one of the severest trials the Catholic undergraduate has to face. The emphasis on science which runs so strongly through the universities today, together with the neglect of, and contempt for, metaphysics, only adds strength to this temptation.

The suggestions that have been made in the last hundred years in order to provide a solution to this problem have, of course, fallen broadly into two classes. On the one hand, in spite of Manning's failure and the ill-conceived Dublin experiment, there

are those who maintain, what is theoretically indisputable, that we shall never achieve our full potential, and that the Catholic intellectual contribution to our society will be no more than halfbaked, unless we can establish in some form or other the equiva-

lent of a Catholic university.1

The other line of thought which circumstances have obliged us to follow has been to make use of the facilities available at our English universities, and to endeavour as best we may to strengthen the moral, philosophical and theological training of Catholic undergraduates by a somewhat haphazard use of Catholic chaplaincies, and the unco-ordinated lectures and conferences associated with them. Mr Evennett has noted:

It is surely in accordance with the English genius that in answering the nice question whether the Church should contract out of the organs of secular and national society or whether she should work in and through them, the ecclesiastical authorities in England should so largely have chosen, wherever possible, the second way. It is, no doubt, very desirable that Catholic scholarship in England should eventually find some adequate and appropriate institutional expression of its own, in the form perhaps of a Higher Institute at which subjects of the greatest moment for religion-Theology, Philosophy, History, Sociology-should be taught and studied at the highest level. Such an Institute, commanding intellectual respect, might find itself endowed with the power of growth. But it is difficult to imagine a general retreat from the existing universities on the part of Catholics in general; and the idea of a full Catholic University to which all English Catholics desirous or deserving of a university education would normally go, would seem, in any foreseeable future for England, to belong to the realm of the Platonic.

Is this really the way the situation should be left? Have we not the duty to explore the possibilities open to us? Perhaps the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The American problem, recently brought into prominence by Mgr John Tracy Ellis's publication, American Catholics and the Intellectual Life, is basically different from our own. American Catholics, like so many of their countrymen, are caught up in the our own. American Catholics, like so many of their countrymen, are caught up in the problems of organization and material progress. There is a contempt for the 'egghead'. To an outsider it seems, however, that some of Mgr Ellis's strictures are unjustly severe. The cross-fertilization of American intellectual life, produced by the presence of so many European Catholic scholars—a happy though not intended result of Nazi tyranny and the Second World War—is producing fruit of high quality, particularly in the field of post-graduate studies in the American Catholic universities. In America, indeed, the means of higher defuction are available, and it is one of the improvent disindeed, the means of higher education are available, and it is one of the important distinctions between English and American Catholic educational effort that, whereas in the nineteenth century our attention in this country was focussed on the saving of Catholic children from the Poor Law schools and on the building up of a system of elementary education, the Americans, as a result of wider vision, or of greater oppor-tunity, embarked on the establishment of a whole array of Catholic universities.

answer will lie in an organized and co-ordinated strengthening of the Catholic chaplaincies and their influence. There are possibilities, more particularly in the provincial universities, for the building up of Catholic centres, whether in the simple form of Halls of Residence, or the development of Catholic colleges. The establishment of Catholic colleges at the older universities should not be entirely ruled out. Opportunities are present, subject only to financial support, for the setting up of chairs of Philosophy. There are also elements which have tended recently to lapse into the background but which might be revived in a form somewhat different from that in which they were conceived in 1863 and 1864. Manning's famous Dublin Review article of July 1863 spoke somewhat airily of all the elements of a Catholic university existing already in the 'four greater colleges of Stonyhurst, Oscott, Old Hall and Ushaw', not to mention the 'eight lesser colleges of Sedgeley Park, Mount St Mary's, St Edward's, Downside, Ratcliffe, St Beuno's, Beaumont Lodge and Ampleforth'. The illconceived scheme, inspired no doubt by Manning, and pressed by Cardinal Barnabò, of a group of Catholic colleges with a peripatetic examining body, was manifestly doomed to failure. It had the merit, however, of emphasizing the intellectual resources which are available in the seminaries. Whether this potential can be tapped in an organized way (apart from the generous services which individual professors have given so readily to, for example, the Newman Association) is a question which is not easy to resolve. The training of a student for the priesthood involves more than high attainment in philosophical and theological studies.1 A priest is 'chosen from among men in the things that appertain to God'. His ascetical and spiritual training are of fundamental importance. This alone, apart from other considerations, is sufficient justification for the segregation of our seminaries from centres of university life. Their founders have tended to seek the quietness and isolation of the countryside as a better setting for the priestly and spiritual training which it is their duty to provide for young men who are offering themselves to God in the priestly state. The problem of the relationships between Catholic laymen educated in the universities and seminary-trained priests is, however, one which needs consideration, and the high

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This is a point overlooked by Wilfrid Ward in his criticism of the 'prevailing method of teaching' in our seminaries, and particularly on some of the 'methods of the Roman schools'. See Maisie Ward, The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition, pp. 65-7.

intellectual qualifications of our seminary staffs could possibly contribute far more than we realize to the wider intellectual life of a university. In this context I may be allowed to quote some words which I addressed to the Pax Romana Congress at Nottingham in 1955:

'In this country there can be no doubt that the theological equipment of our Catholic students is woefully deficient. Many students from their own zeal and enthusiasm embark on personal courses of reading to supplement their deficiency. Attempts are made in the Universities to provide regular theological conferences. but those who are closest to Catholic life in our Universities will agree that, while faith and the love of our Blessed Lord are strong. the theological equipment of most Catholic students scarcely rises above an average sixth-form level and cannot compare in depth or maturity with the advances in secular studies which take place during the university years. Many of our teaching orders of nuns suffer from a similar handicap. I wonder, also, to what extent the theological faculties in the Catholic universities throughout the world have in mind the proper equipping of the Catholic layman, and whether they are not too closely confined to providing for the professional needs of students for the priesthood and for our doctors in philosophy and theology who will later grace the rostra of our seminaries and theological faculties. Are our graduates being provided with the theological equipment which they need if they are to exercise effectively the apostolate of the Catholic intellectual or the educated Catholic layman? Are they equipped to solve the problems which a Catholic meets in the modern world?"

It is manifest that there is no easy answer to all these problems, but it is no less manifest that they are problems which should be stated and should be examined with care, with a sense of responsibility and with loyalty to the Church. The solutions may take long to formulate—they may take longer still to put into practice—but the Catholic community, with the growing opportunities now available to it, would be lacking in consideration of the coming generations and failing to give its contribution to the discussion of this complex, yet ever-present, problem, were it to fail to face in the middle of the twentieth century the question of the intellectual needs of our Catholic young men and women, and the immense contribution which Catholics may be able to offer to the intellectual life of this country and the preservation of what we must still consider the roots and strength of Christian civilization.

<sup>1</sup> See The Life of Faith, C.T.S. (Do 292), p. 17.

The expansion of universities since the war has seen a considerable increase in the number not only of Catholic students but also of the Catholic members of the teaching staffs. The university chaplains meet together annually to discuss questions of policy and the difficulties they face, but no attempt has yet been made to arrange a general meeting of Catholic professors and lecturers, who are directly concerned with the various questions raised by the changing educational pattern of Catholic life in Great Britain.

Before his death, the late Cardinal Griffin gave approval to the suggestion that it might be useful to call together a conference on 'The Higher Education of Catholics', to be attended by university teachers, chaplains and such members of the clergy as would be directly interested in the subject through their work in seminaries, training colleges and other educational fields. Details of the scheme have now received the approval of His Grace the Archbishop of Westminster and of the Hierarchy. The Conference will take place at St Mary's College, Strawberry Hill, from 15 to 18 September. The theme proposed is a wide one, comprising such subjects as the place of theology and philosophy in the education of a layman, the relation of Catholic philosophy to science, the desirability of closer contacts between seminaries and universities, the effect on Catholics of the intellectual environment of modern universities, and so on.

The articles which are presented in the present number of The Dublin Review have been written with this conference in mind. It is hoped that they will focus attention on some of the problems raised by the theme of the conference, and may provide a basis of discussion not only for those who will attend the conference, but for all Catholics who realize the importance and range of the problem which is being considered.

# THE CATHOLIC STUDENT AND PHILOSOPHY

## By D. J. B. HAWKINS

THERE are two sorts of Catholic student of philosophy, the student in the seminary and the student in the university, and their problems may be described as equal and opposite. The seminarist is introduced to a philosophical tradition which comes down from the Greeks and the Middle Ages, and harmonizes admirably with Catholic theology, but which hardly prepares him sufficiently to make contact with contemporary philosophy. The undergraduate in this country is initiated into a style of philosophizing which takes little account of past history and may seem to make impossible or meaningless many assertions which as a Catholic he is bound to make. What is to be done about this situation?

#### 1

Fair discussion must take account of the very various opinions entertained by Catholics of the value of contemporary British philosophy. There are still some who suppose that all original philosophy produced later than 1300 is moonshine, and at the other extreme there appear to be some who think that all future philosophy must be based exclusively on Wittgenstein. It is perhaps unnecessary to take either of these extremes too seriously, but there are plenty of intermediate positions which demand attention.

It is commonly stated by contemporary philosophers, and apparently some Catholics agree, that there has been a revolution in philosophy, and there can be no doubt that this alleged revolution is due to the work of Wittgenstein. But it is much easier to find philosophers who proclaim this revolution in enthusiastic terms than to find anyone who will explain what precisely it is about. The slogan of 'linguistic analysis' is not very helpful. All

philosophers have had to scrutinize their verbal tools with some care, and notable instances of linguistic analysis can be found in Plato, Aristotle, St Thomas Aquinas, Uncle Tom Cobley and all. Is it meant that philosophy ought to be exclusively linguistic analysis? But the object in view is not the comparative beauty of sounds; it is the appropriateness of language to fact, and any such linguistic analysis goes hand in hand with doctrines about the nature of fact even though these may be left implicit. Is it intended that the function of philosophy should be exclusively critical, the correction of muddled thinking? But, then again, it is only in virtue of beliefs about fact that we can judge thinking to be muddled.

Reference to Wittgenstein himself does not get us much further. The *Tractatus*, no doubt, restricts the possibility of exact speech to the kind of thing that is said in the natural sciences, but the later Wittgenstein puts no limit to the number of ways in which language may be properly used, apart from the pragmatic test of whether it works. He still indeed rejects metaphysics and holds that the task of philosophy is simply to dissipate verbal muddles, but it is no longer clear why he maintains these positions. It is up to some disciple of Wittgenstein to uncover and explain the latent presuppositions of the fragmentary *Philosophical Investigations*.

It is also up to the Catholics who speak of a revolution in philosophy, and appear to rejoice in it, to explain exactly why they do so. It may be that they regard the defence of commonsense language on its own level in *Philosophical Investigations* as a defence of the commonsense assumptions in philosophy which were made in ancient and mediaeval thought and have been threatened by more recent theories of knowledge. They welcome the principle of a severe scrutiny of language, and, since metaphysical truths were allowed by the *Tractatus*, if not to be statable, at least to show themselves, they may have taken courage from the more liberal atmosphere of *Philosophical Investigations* to seek sympathy for an attempt to state them in a new way. But all this seems to be a rather precarious reliance on the incidental concessions of a fundamentally destructive genius.

I will not, therefore, apologize for the opinion that the alleged revolution in philosophy is scarcely more than a new look. We may be grateful that dogmatic logical positivism is no longer with us, but its spirit is very much alive in an undogmatic form. The

differences between philosophers are rooted in their different theories of knowledge. We are still, that is, in the epistemological phase of the history of philosophy which was inaugurated by Descartes, and British philosophy is more dominated by Hume than it has ever been before. Philosophers are probably readier for something new than they were in the recent past, but nothing in radical opposition to Hume has yet produced any considerable effect.

While others, as was already said, take a more favourable view of contemporary developments in British philosophy, few Catholics are likely to hold that philosophy as now presented in British universities offers an adequate diet for the Catholic undergraduate. At its worst it beckons him quite definitely in the direction of scepticism. At its best it drives a gulf between reason and faith and leaves him, as a Catholic, in a position like that which was called fideism a century ago. There are, indeed, quite a number of fideists among our younger Catholic laymen. All honour to them for having preserved the faith in an adverse climate of opinion, but their position is very far from that integration of faith and reason which is the Catholic ideal.

#### II

On the other side, what do we mean if we describe ourselves as scholastics or Thomists, with or without the prefix of 'neo'? It implies a conviction that the Greek intellectualism which has its roots in Plato and Aristotle, and was assimilated by Western Europe in the thirteenth century, has not been superseded by later investigations. It conveys the belief that modern philosophical questions can be answered in such a way as to reassert this tradition and that, consequently, there is by rights a perennial philosophy which is capable of further development without losing its essential character. More rigid criteria might be proposed, but it seems desirable here to exhibit the tradition in its most comprehensive form without emphasizing the opinions of this or that section of its adherents.

The revival of this tradition in modern times has, of course, mainly been the work of Catholics, and it has received official encouragement from Leo XIII and his successors. It is evident, however, that the Church as such does not impose a philosophical

system. Philosophical propositions may be asserted by the Church when they fall in some respect within the range of theology; outstanding examples are to be found in what the Vatican Council says about the relations of faith and reason. Philosophical systems may be condemned by the Church when they lead to consequences incompatible with faith; such were the condemnations of Hermes and Günther in the last century. But a positive philosophical system belongs to an analytic dimension of thought which is other than the level of dogmatic definition and, if it is adopted, must be adopted on appropriate grounds of rational evidence.

Where the Church legislates, and has an obvious right to legislate, is about the way in which philosophy should be taught to her future ministers. The place of Thomism in the seminary is laid down by canon law. While, then, fair discussion must acknowledge that Catholics are not unanimous in their judgements of the value of Thomism, it will be useful, in considering the problem of philosophy in the seminary, to avow a point of view which not only accepts but welcomes the law of the Church on this matter and asks how it can be made more effective for the promotion of a

healthy philosophical activity.

For it is pretty clear that, in spite of much worthy effort by our philosophy lecturers, seminary philosophy does not attain notably successful results. One reason, no doubt, is that our colleges are isolated units. A hortus conclusus may be a suitable atmosphere for the development of the mystical life, but it tends to be lacking in intellectual stimulus. Even the best lecturer may become somewhat rusty if he has nobody to contradict him. So it sometimes happens that our philosophical courses are given with quite insufficient regard for what is happening in the outside philosophical world. The contemporary student will not be roused from his slumbers by being told that the adversaries of a thesis are Henricus Gandavensis and Ricardus a Mediavilla; he needs rather to be brought up against Lord Russell and Professor Ayer.

In any case the student may need a good deal of rousing. It might indeed be asked why he should be expected to become keen on philosophy. The purpose of a seminary is to produce priests rather than philosophers. But this objection over-reaches itself, for it would suggest that a course of philosophy is out of place in the seminary. There is a ground for its existence, for a theological view of the world needs to be seen in harmony with a general view

of the world based on reason. Even if the number of philosophers among the members of an average parish is small, its pastors are all the better off for a philosophical background, both for their own sakes and for the sake of the small but increasing number of

the laity who have some taste for philosophical enquiry.

In the atmosphere of the seminary, however, philosophy can be too easily regarded as a kind of preparatory theology with similar standards of orthodoxy from which it is shocking to depart. The enquiring student is apt to be regarded as a bit of a nuisance. But it appears to be a law of human development that, if a man is ever to learn to talk sense, he must first be indulged by being allowed to talk a lot of nonsense. We are not likely to produce convinced and effective Thomists unless they have honestly faced and explored the alternatives.

These points, with whatever degree of validity they have in particular places and particular circumstances, may help to explain why, since seminaries and religious houses of study are the only potential sources of corporate Thomistic philosophical activity in this country, there is, in fact, so little of it. In principle we ought to be opposing contemporary philosophical negations by offering the genuine remedy in copious and striking form, but the contemporary philosopher can almost be excused if he does

not notice our existence.

#### TIT

What can be done to meet these difficulties apart from what is implicit in the remarks already made? As far as the seminaries are concerned, do we need a major and a minor course, a major course not only for the few who at present go to universities abroad but for all who would profit from it, and a minor course for those whose patron is the Curé of Ars? There can be no doubt that at present the abler student is often handicapped by having to wait for the less able. But this would require an immense reorganization and would bring us up against the principle of the diocesan seminary, to which many are so attached. Moreover, a student is really too young at twenty or so to make the best of an advanced course of philosophy.

Perhaps the difficulty could be met by making the present customary two years more explicitly what they obviously must be,

a simple course of introduction. Questions of more purely academic interest could be subordinated to those questions belonging to the foundations of religion, like free will, immortality, the existence of God, and natural law, which even the youngest and least intellectual of students would see to be of as much interest and relevance to his chosen task in life as the organization of football pools. The time gained could be devoted to a critical history of philosophy coming right down to the present day and emphasizing contemporary questions. Problems come more easily alive for anyone in a historical setting, and such a history would be the best foundation for the advanced studies of those who were capable of making them later on. For these advanced studies, to which it is to be hoped that more would be sent than at present, we should need a central institute of philosophy and theology preferably in as close a connexion as was feasible with one of the universities, which would also be a source of mutual stimulus and collaboration to the scholars entrusted with its direction. Such an institute would also provide Thomism with a more obvious existence within the horizon of the secular universities.

But what is to be done about the Catholic undergraduate with present resources? Evidently there is no complete solution short of Thomism becoming a living issue in the universities themselves. As it is, it can only appear as an occasional irruption from another world. Now, as Newman told us, and as we should hardly need Newman to tell us, there is no true university education which is not integrated by a philosophy and a theology. Our undergraduates require philosophy and theology for their own sakes and not merely as a counterblast to negative influences. Every effort must be made to provide them, even if the conditions are

not propitious.

of

n

For the conditions are not propitious. University chaplains often say that undergraduates do not realize the need or have so much to do to keep up with their official course that they have no time for anything else of a systematic nature. More is able to be done in London on account of the vast number of students, but those who benefit can scarcely be more than a small minority. It is also the custom at various universities for the chaplain or the Catholic society to call in visiting philosophical lecturers from time to time, and the local students of philosophy are often invited to the meeting. As one who has frequently officiated in this capacity I would say that a certain problem is presented by an Vol. 232. No. 476.

audience composed partly of Catholics, most of whom know nothing of philosophy, and partly of students of philosophy, none of whom know anything of Thomism. The practical way of dealing with the problem seems to be to try to give the latter something to think about while impressing the former by showing them that their foes can be withstood on the philosophical level. On reflexion this seems pretty poor, but what else is to be done?

This article, however, is mainly concerned with the presentation of the problems and is intended to provide material for discussion. It is certainly necessary that more people should see the problems and try to answer them. Perhaps, if collective wisdom is

brought to bear, they will find a solution.

# WHERE ARE THE SACRED SCIENCES?

## By THE ABBOT OF DOWNSIDE

"ACRED science' is a term which has an unfamiliar ring in modern English, and indeed the application of the word science to the sphere of religion would be regarded by many of our fellow-countrymen as something strange. I had a friend at Oxford who maintained that mathematics and theology were the only exact sciences; but he was a brilliant, paradoxical creature. Far more typical of the common attitude was the eminent historian who, on hearing an argument which, if accepted, would have taken the audience straight to the Catholic Church, replied that, while he admitted that it sounded quite logical, yet for himself he held that charity is superior to logic. This is the sort of thing, forming a whole approach to, and presentation of, the Christian gospel, which produces in the minds of our contemporaries the vague, half-conscious, idea that Christianity does not submit to rational criteria, but is 'only' a beautiful, and perhaps useful, myth.

In strict parlance, a sacred science is one which takes its postulates from revelation, especially as articulated in dogmatic formulations, and on that basis pursues an intellectual and discursive

115

penetration of God's word to man. Such a science is supernatural theology strictly so-called, and as conceived by St Thomas Aquinas it is a single science embracing both our knowledge of God in his redeeming act, and man's utilization of that knowledge in the development of the Christian life. In more modern times divisions have been introduced into this single science, so that we talk of dogmatic and moral theology as two separate sciences, and they have come to be taught by different specialists, with some resultant loss, probably to dogmatic theology, and certainly to her less aristocratic, but more 'practical', sister. It may be remarked that for St Thomas, and consistently with his synoptic view, theology was at a level transcending the distinction between speculative and practical knowledge.

e-

el.

S-

he

e.

d

d

But besides dogmatic and moral theology the ecclesiastical student today studies also two other 'subjects': Scripture and Church history. For St Thomas the Bible and the liturgy and tradition of the Church were 'sources', which contained the doctrines of the Church, and whence ultimately the theologian derived the postulates of his science; and the Fathers of the Church were not only a treasure-house of tradition in this sense, but also authoritative exponents of the meaning of revelation—they were venerated, though perhaps unsystematic, theologians, just as Aristotle was 'the' philosopher, and whenever possible their theological verdicts had to be shown to be in harmony with one's own.

In substance, this attitude of St Thomas to the Bible and the history of the Church survives today. But in modern times there have grown up two massive and most important intellectual disciplines, critical Biblical scholarship and critical Church history. It may be that this remarkable modern development will in the end count as much for the intellectual life of the Church as the great scholastic developments of the Middle Ages, so strikingly different in 'atmosphere' and orientation from the intellectual culture of the patristic age. The great central datum of redeemed humanity is the concrete fact of the Incarnation and the 'mystical' Body of Christ, le fait chrétien in its total past and present actuality; and the approach to a concrete fact is subtly different from the kind of deduction which leads to formal logic. I hope, therefore, that I need not apologize for including the critical study of the Bible and of Church history in the scope of this essay, and even, in view of local and contemporary circumstances, concentrating attention upon it.

The early growth of modern documentary and historical criticism was perhaps not unconnected with the Reformation controversies. The Reformers quickly understood that, if their rejection of Catholic dogma was to be made intellectually respectable. it must find some rational basis. The basis they took was an appeal from the practice and belief of the contemporary Church, not to the more immediate past, but rather to the Bible, the authority of which was accepted on both sides of the dispute. When Catholics replied by appealing to tradition, Protestant scholarship attacked, when it could, the authenticity of the documents in which tradition was supposed to be enshrined, and was not unwilling to rewrite the history of the Christian past, Documentary and historical criticism are fascinating games and were soon applied in the secular sphere, and eventually to the Bible itself. When the whole of ancient history was under review, and when the horizons of historical knowledge were expanding in space and time, it was inevitable that Israelite-Christian history would come to be viewed as part of the general discipline of history. In an age of philosophical uncertainty and theological decadence the empirical character of critical studies seemed to offer a promise of objectivity independent of the chaos of the schools, and comparable to that attributed to the natural sciences, whose flowering has been a major feature of post-Reformation times.

Especially has Biblical criticism been pursued outside the Church. This has been partly due to the lack, in Protestantism, of an architectonic theology like that which the Church has inherited from the Middle Ages. Partly, no doubt, it has been due to Protestantism's reliance on Scripture as its sole external authority for belief. And while in England our native empiricism has been attracted by this form of study, in Germany it was nursed and fostered by the general influence and prestige of the great German historical school. There was, it is true, important progress in Catholic Biblical scholarship in the last years of the nineteenth century and the first few years of the twentieth, but it suffered a severe set-back when the extravagances of Modernism provoked the extremely sharp reaction of the Holy See under St Pius X. During the present Pontificate there has been a welcome revival; and this has been paralleled by a trend in non-Catholic Biblical scholarship to what may almost be called a post-critical conservatism and a new interest in synthesis, often described by the

rather vague title of Biblical Theology.

riti-

con-

iec-

ble.

peal

t to

v of

lics

red.

ion

rite

ical

the

ole

of

was

ved

ilo-

cal

ec-

to

een

the

, of

ted

to

ity

en

nd

an

in

th

l a ed

al

Biblical scholarship within the Church flourishes especially in France, Belgium, and to some extent Germany. But our present concern is with our own country. What contribution is English Catholicism making, what contribution has it made in our century, to the general progress of such studies? The answer must be: practically none. Obviously we have our enuditi, and all honour to them. But if we are asked for the names of English Catholic Scriptural scholars who have achieved an international reputation as such, it is hard to think of any except the late H. J. Chapman, who could discuss on something like equal terms with Harnack, but who unfortunately published little in this field beyond some invaluable articles, now largely forgotten. One Catholic Englishman has held the presidency of the Society of Old Testament Studies; a very few have been members of the younger Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, an international body which includes in its numbers almost every eminent Biblical scholar of the non-Catholic world, and now has a sprinkling of foreign Catholic members (including one on the editorial board of its quarterly journal, New Testament Studies). Doubtless a great step forward was taken with the publication in 1953 of A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture. The welcome this work received, not only in Catholic circles, is both an indication of the need which it sought to meet and a promise of the reception that would be accorded to further Catholic works of Biblical scholarship in this country. It was less the fault of the contributors than a result of our general backwardness that the contributions were of unequal value and the total outcome seemed to be 'behind the times'.1

In the field of Christian history outside the New Testament we have at least two major historians: Professor Knowles and Mgr Philip Hughes. As regards the Age of the Fathers, it is a pity that the first volume of the latter's general Church history was also one of his earliest works, written when he had not yet attained the full range of his powers. But there are several other names,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In a friendly review, the editor of the Revue Biblique, the great Dominican periodical, wrote: 'One observes with regret a general tendency' in this volume 'to consider the less advanced positions as more faithful to sound Catholic doctrine. But a defensive attitude, restricting to a minimum the concessions required by the progress of criticism, does more harm than good. The Holy See's encouragement invites us to work more constructively. True, this is a manual for the general public; and this explains and in large measure justifies the rule of prudence that it has adopted. Still, the critical education of the Christian people is necessary today, if we are to avoid the dangers of disillusionment. And then too we must think of non-Catholics, who will not be attracted if they think that every good Catholic must adopt these conservative views.' (October, 1947.)

largely Jesuit; and the mediaeval period has some able Catholic

laymen to boast of.

It would be pleasant if we could contrast with our poverty in the field of Scripture a large and challenging output in that of dogmatic theology. But it is not so. Our published work rarely rises above the standard of the manuals, and a book like Fr Bernard Leeming's *Principles of Sacramental Theology* has not only intrinsic but rarity value. Our shortcomings here are the more serious because, in the realm of Scripture, the best non-Catholic work, prudently used, can supply part of our own deficiency; but we cannot expect works of Catholic dogmatic theology except from Catholics.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am not saying that we have not got able scholars and profound theologians. I only say that they do not get into print. Absence of smoke may not prove absence of fire, even if it sometimes makes one a little suspicious.

Why are we so poverty-stricken? There are some obvious answers. For well over a century we have been a pastoral church in the rather narrow sense of the term. Until quite recently we were a Church with a small unintellectual aristocracy and a large ill-educated proletariat. Our numbers were being increased by immigration from Ireland, as they still are, and the priests who came over thence to help us in our resultant need were naturally men who had not yet established themselves in Ireland as scholars, and who, on arrival here, were drafted immediately into the front line of urgent parochial or 'missionary' work. We have had hardly any cultured middle-class population, and therefore have not felt the need of a clergy who could cope with the needs of such a class. The Oxford converts were a small body, and they came from a section of Anglicanism which was suspicious of Biblical criticism and in any case was interested in a different sort of things. We have been very much alive to the problems of education, but primarily at the elementary level, and only recently, so far as the male sex is concerned, at the level of the grammar-school. Newman's hope for an English-speaking university was defeated in the form which it had taken in his own mind, with the odd result that English Catholics who go to Ireland for higher studies seem to prefer Trinity College, Dublin, to the Catholic universities; naturally, they do not study the Bible there. Manning's attempt to create a sort of English Institut Catholique was a fiasco, and this failure has probably discouraged us ever since. It is obvious, both

a priori and by experience, that diocesan seminaries cannot fill the gap caused by the lack of any massive intellectual focus for the country as a whole. Nor can one religious Order, under our present conditions, provide us with the sort of learned journal which we need.

There is in all this something approaching a vicious circle. It may be said that while it is certainly desirable to have a clergy trained in modern scholarship and in living speculative theology, vet the main problem for our church today is to provide and prepare a pastoral clergy. Perhaps we need to enlarge our idea of the pastorate. Meanwhile we have a church which, to its eternal credit, is sprung from the soil of the lowly people to whom the primitive Church, in Gentile lands, made its first appeal: 'Not many of you are wise, in the world's fashion, not many powerful, not many well born.' But whereas the early Church moved up into the intellectual field, knowing instinctively that what claims to be catholic must be present at every level and in every aspect of human living, we are tending to perpetuate the situation in which we find ourselves. This is surely short-sighted, even on a practical estimate. Years ago a young Protestant was thinking of devoting himself to the work of a clergyman in the slums, and he received, from an intelligent Protestant, the advice: 'Leave the slums to others and go and convert Oxford; that is the way to convert England.'

A danger, however, lurks in viewing the Church's intellectual life too narrowly from a pastoral or apostolic angle. It tends to canalize our efforts, such as they are or may be, into controversial scholarship in the rather restricted sense of that term. Controversial scholarship and theology are to pure scholarship and theology as applied science is to pure science; and the hidden springs of applied science are in pure science. I would hazard the guess that Bremond's volumes on the literary history of religious thought in France are ultimately more fruitful for the salvation and sanctification of souls than an equal number of pages of apologetics. Do we really care at all about pure scholarship and pure speculative theology in this English Church of ours?

In fact there can be no doubt that by developing a first-rate tradition of sincere, bold, humble Biblical scholarship among ourselves we should be doing something of the highest value for the conversion of England. Bible reading has not been our strong point. It used to be much more prevalent among Protestants than

it is today; but even today new scriptural translations seem to command a most encouraging sale. The point, however, is that Biblical scholarship is respected; and it exists among our non-Catholic neighbours in a measure which would enable them to appreciate it among ourselves. I have already remarked that they have little speculative theology. It is significant that The Journal of Theological Studies, one of the glories of English Christian thought and learning, is almost entirely devoted to Biblical and has a second scholarship; in the current number scarcely a dozen pages out at over two hundred desert these fields for anything like philosophy (as distinct from history of philosophy) or speculative theology. Any English Catholic who is competent to take his place in the milieux where such scholarship is pursued is welcomed with open arms and with the most engaging friendship and esteem. Here, then, is an area where something can be done to break down the barriers of sheer ignorance which cut our fellow-countrymen off from any adequate understanding of what we are and what we stand for.

In short, we English Catholics are not playing our due part in the intellectual life of the Church as a whole, and are not doing what, by sound learning, we might be doing towards the conversion of our country. We may well ask ourselves what we can do to remedy this state of affairs. The first thing, no doubt, is to convince ourselves of the facts and to admit to ourselves that they are deplorable. The second is, not to let ourselves or others think that it is because we are Catholics that we lead so impoverished an intellectual life; the proof of this, within the field we have been specially considering, is the very flourishing condition of such

studies among Catholics on the Continent.

Granted these two points, the question arises, whether we want to find a remedy. In his Essay on the Restoration of Private Property Belloc insists that no restoration is possible unless people can come to want it. The same is true for the problem we are here considering. If the Church in England wants to develop sound learning, if it is ready to pay the price for such a development, then remedies can be found. The price is partly monetary; learning requires both capital endowment and income. This is undoubtedly a grave difficulty at a time when education at the primary and secondary levels is absorbing such vast sums of Catholic money every year. We have, I think, to ask ourselves whether or not the policy of 'quick returns' is ultimately the best for the promotion

of God's cause. But there is also a price to be paid in personnel, since potential scholars are usually the sort of people who could instead make themselves useful in other spheres, even if only that of schoolteaching. Given the men and the money, the remaining difficulty would be the overcoming of our local and institutional divisions. Scholarship cannot be promoted on a merely diocesan basis, and if it is organized separately by the separate religious Orders there is a danger of ruining its integrity by esprit de corps. In all this, it is important to bear in mind that our problem is not one which can be simply passed off on to bishops and religious superiors. What is wanted is a change of heart and purpose in the Church in England at large.

Little has here been said of the sacred sciences as fields of work for the laity. This is not because I subscribe to the famous dictum that the task of the laity is to hunt and shoot and fish. It is worth while remembering that almost the only English Catholic theological thinkers of the twentieth century who have exerted a great and deep influence outside the limits of the Church were Wilfrid Ward and Friedrich von Hügel, both laymen, But in the nature of the case, lay theologians and Biblical scholars are not likely to abound or do useful work unless there is a strong backing of clerical support. Moreover, you cannot legislate for the production of lay theologians and Biblical scholars, though you can encourage it. You can do something concrete for the improvement of the level and output of clerical scholarship and thought, and I venture to think that one of the greatest services that our generation could render to the Church and our country would be the initiation and carrying through of such measures as would lead eventually to the existence amongst us of a vigorous and respected class of Biblical scholars and original speculative theologians.

## THE NEED FOR CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SCHOLARSHIP

## By DAVID KNOWLES

Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge

VERY Catholic, and indeed everyone who calls himself a Christian, whatever his profession or pursuits may be, has by virtue of his religion an interest in history. However wide his scientific knowledge or his philosophical outlook, however great his understanding of physics or his contempt for metaphysics, he cannot neglect history, for it is part-nay, it is the essence-of his faith that the transcendent Creator of the universe, on a certain day and at a certain place, and at an ascertainable conjuncture of the world's history, came upon the earth to teach and to save the human race, and to endow the sons of his election with the inheritance of divine life. Moreover, a preparation was made for this coming both by the choice of a people who were for many centuries the recipients of God's commandments, and by the words of prophecy inspired by the Holy Spirit, and God's presence on this earth was accompanied by the establishment of a Church that will endure as long as the human race, with the task of preaching and the gift of understanding and presenting with evergrowing clarity the message of salvation. The Catholic Christian, therefore, is pledged to a view of history, one might almost say a philosophy of history, sharply distinct from that of an ancient pagan or of a modern agnostic or materialist. History is not only the record of the growth and decline of empires, societies, cultures and races, but also the record of the fortunes of God's children, a people chosen and won by God Himself, and of the living Church of God. So far all thinking Catholics would agree, but the number of those who would go further and deeper along this line of thought is surprisingly small. Yet while it is true that faith is a gift of God and that the gospel can be preached and heard by little ones and by the unlearned, it is also true that once we begin

123

to consider the part of human endeavour in the matter of understanding and penetrating the truths of faith and the ways of God, a knowledge of history is, after theology and the study of Scripture, the most valuable of all mental possessions. The background of classical and oriental civilization, the moment of peace in the empire that embraced almost the whole world as it was known to the Mediterranean peoples, the early opposition and the final capitulation of the government of the Empire to Christianity—all this sets the Christian message so clearly forth against the confusion and poverty of human thought and endeavour that the argument from history is one of the strongest arguments of the apologists for the divine origin of the Church. Indeed, a familiarity with the early history of the Church does far more than serve as a setting to the gospel narrative; it gives the Christian of today a new kind of hindsight into the economy of salvation.

As that familiarity grows, so also does the consciousness grow of a unity of faith and purpose through the ages. While on the one hand the acorn is seen to grow into an oak which has little outward resemblance to it-the Rome of Leo X or Pius XII to the Rome of Peter, the pontificial High Mass to the Lord's Supper of the Corinthians—we can on the other hand begin to glimpse the richness of the faith of apostolic and patristic days. The apostolic church, nearer to the pure fountain-head, saw the substance of the divine truth as vividly, if more simply, than the Church of today. If a study of the history of the Church had nothing else to give, the mental and spiritual assurance that the historian finds would be more than sufficient reward. Again and again the Catholic Christian must exclaim to himself, as he reads the letters of the apostolic fathers or the Enchiridion of St Augustine: 'There is our faith, there is our life. We are the true heirs of the faith and the sacramental life of those men.' If the contemplative and the theologian can see, in their different ways, the unchanging substance of God's truth, the same yesterday and today, so can the historian in his degree. It is, or should be, one of the great gifts of a study of history that the superficial differences, the changing garments of the centuries, are not mistaken for changes of substance and essence.

In yet another way the historian will be able to separate the essential from the accidental, the divine from the human, in the Church of Christ. One of the gifts that the passage of years may bring to the individual is the wisdom of experience and long observation; the expectations and despairs of earlier years are replaced

by a saner estimate and a more sober hope. So the historian, contemplating the lamentable weakness and catastrophes of men within the Church, whether in his own day or centuries ago, is able to realize that such things have been before and will be again, but that the light of the Holy Spirit, though now and then dimmed and obscured by human weakness and malice, will shine forth again in due time. Whether it is a decadent papacy, a worldly monastery, an extravagant devotional practice or a popular superstition, the historian will be able to say with Odysseus: 'Bear it, dear heart, for thou hast borne ere now a worse blow than this.'

Yet in spite of the value of history to Catholics as individuals, and to the Church in every country as a discipline and as an aid to theology, the number of Catholic historians—that is, of those seriously engaged upon scholarly writing and research-is at the present moment very small in the British Isles. This is not due to any difficulties or prejudice that Catholics encounter, for these may be said to be non-existent today in the academic world of English-speaking peoples. Nor is there any prejudice against a revision of history in a sense favourable to the Church, if the evidence leads a fair enquirer that way. Naturally, Catholics and Free Church historians will never agree in the interpretation they put upon such a confused and controversial period as that of the Reformation between the emergence of Luther and the end of the Council of Trent, but even here the extent of agreement upon questions of fact and motive is far greater than it was fifty years ago. Where there is no living issue at stake the agreement is often all-but complete. Whether it be the age of Constantine or that of Bede, the contest of Empire and Papacy or the development of scholastic thought, the general unaniminity of treatment among historians of all nations and confessions is as noteworthy as it is welcome.

For all this, there is a dearth of Catholic scholars in England. To one who considers the matter, it can scarcely be in doubt that Catholics today in England make a poorer show in scholarship and in the academic world than they do in almost any other activity of educated men. In technology, in accountancy, in diplomacy, in journalism and the writing of fiction, in the civil service, in the Army and in the R.A.F., a careful censor could probably find something like the 8-9 per cent that is the Catholic percentage of the total population. Even in the so-called learned

125

professions the proportion of Catholics in medicine and law is probably as high as could be expected, and in school-teachers at the secondary and grammar school level it is probably higher. But in the rapidly expanding academic world, and above all in the smaller class of productive scholars, it is very low, and this is true also within our own class of historians. Yet probably the numbers of Catholic students at the university, even in our day of many universities, come very near to the national percentage.

This lack of Catholic scholars is apparent if we take another angle of vision. Within the past sixty-odd years the history of the Church in mediaeval England from Augustine to Cranmer has been systematically explored and re-written. In the nineteenth century almost all accounts, apart from Lingard's, were tinged, if not with an anti-Catholic, at least with a pro-Protestant or a pro-Anglican bias. Today we can read, in the standard histories and the text-books of the highest calibre, the history of the Church in England presented with a technical correctness and an absolute fairness that a Catholic could not wish to see bettered. This great work has been done by a multitude of hands, many of them those of devout Anglicans-by Zachary Brooke, R. W. Chambers, Stenton, Hamilton Thompson, Powicke, Darlington, Cheney, Miss Whitelock and Miss R. Graham. There exists no longer in the mediaeval centuries any distinction of outlook, any serious difference of interpretation, between Catholics and non-Catholics. This is a great achievement, and it is being continued today by younger scholars such as R. W. Southern and Professor C. N. L. Brooke; but all these names suggest to us that in the first thirty or forty years of this century Catholic mediaevalists at Oxford, Cambridge, London and Manchester were very few, and far between. Nor are mediaeval studies in a class by themselves in this respect.

What has been said of the dearth of Catholic scholars in general is particularly applicable to the clergy, both regular and secular. Here the contrast is not so much that between Catholic and non-Catholic as between English and continental. Abroad, and especially in France, Belgium, Germany, and latterly also Italy and Spain, many of the most distinguished names in the fields of church history and mediaeval history of all kinds are those of priests. Many of these no doubt are from the religious Orders, Benedictine, Franciscan, Dominican and Jesuit in particular, but many also are from the modern congregations and

from the secular clergy. Duchesne, Vacandard, Batiffol and Baudrillart are only four of the most eminent names of the last two generations. In Belgium there has been a succession of distinguished historians at Louvain and elsewhere, to say nothing of the Bollandists, while in Germany one thinks at once of Grahmann and his school. No doubt in all these countries the numbers available, even if the line is drawn beneath pratiquants and above comants, are far larger than with us, but it is nevertheless true that the intellectual climate for all is far different. What country other than France could produce—and sell—that magnificent series of Dictionnaires of Theology, of History, of Spirituality, of Apologetics and of Canon Law that are the finest monument in our age of Catholic scholarship? Compared with them the Catholic Encyclobedia, excellent as much of it is, appears almost provincial and second-class, and where today could we find the writers and editors and publishers for another Encyclopedia as good as that of fifty years ago?

Abroad, one takes it as natural that among the foremost names, not only in theology, philosophy and biblical studies, but also in all the other humane disciplines, should be priests, and often secular priests. Here, no doubt, the stimulus of competition and the possibilities of economic support count for much. In all the Catholic areas of Europe, but especially in Belgium and France, there are not only a number of high academic posts reserved for, or at least open to, priests, but there are also a number of chaplaincies with comfortable emoluments available for scholars of proved worth, which provide the modicum of leisure and economic independence essential for large-scale planning and works of scholarship de longue haleine. In this country a priest who is a scholar has neither of these two means of encouragement and subsistence. The 'professor' at one of our seminaries or houses of study is in quite a different position, hard-worked and without any contacts with the world of scholarship, and the very few clerical sinecures that exist are usually reserved for diocesan administrators.

There can be no doubt that the great need in the field of history is for more Catholics and priests competent to fill a post and take their place alongside non-Catholics in the academic world. The critical, truculent attitude adopted by Hilaire Belloc, and by lesser men in his train, towards dons and academic historians, though partially justifiable seventy years ago, was out of

and

ast

lis-

of

nn

ail-

04-

the

her

of

lo-

ige

:lo-

nd

nd

of

ost

ut

nd

all

nd

re

nd

d

ıt

date long before Belloc ceased to write. One could wish, now that universities are springing up 'like asparagus in May', that there was in this country some institute of the quality of the Pontifical Institute at Toronto. A learned clergy, or at least a solid body of learning among the clergy, is always a distinction and a power to a church. The Catholic clergy in England contains, in proportion to its numbers, few scholars, and of those few the majority either belong to the religious orders or are converts from Anglicanism. The great numerical increase in our body within the past fifty years, and the practically total disappearance of prejudiced opposition in official quarters, have not been accompanied by a proportionate increase in the volume of learned historical work. One reason, no doubt, is the constant call for expansion and the provision of Mass and the sacraments all over the land. Another is the insatiable demand of education below the university level, which has taken many a promising scholar among the young priests to be a headmaster or sixth-form master of a grammar school or to be a house master at one of the Catholic public schools. It is a notable and in some ways a deplorable circumstance that the houses of studies at the universities, both of the religious and of the secular clergy, that have been in existence now, some of them, for more than half a century, should have produced so few writers or scholars of note. They have been, in fact, almost entirely nurseries of schoolmasters. Perhaps they must always remain so; perhaps the most hopeful course, at least so far as history is concerned, would be the establishment, even on the smallest scale, of a separate house of research studies at one of the three or four English universities where library resources and manuscript or record materials exist.

If even that is too much to hope for, at least a plea may be made for the young priest or religious who shows promise of real scholarship and aptitude for research. He will always be a rare bird—far too rare to do damage or to set precedents. Those who are in any way responsible for disposing of the lives and talents of others would do well to realize that the conditions of scholarship are very different now from what they were fifty years ago. For the layman capable and desirous of ascending the academic ladder the opportunities are far greater. Research grants, student-ships and fellowships, a sufficiency of academic posts with opportunities for private work, a regular system of travel grants and sabbatical periods, and a reasonable, if not lavish, salary give

scope for those with a real vocation for scholarship. The scholar in private place, on the other hand, is far less advantageously placed than before. Access to books, funds and opportunities for travel and for the purchase of photostats and microfilms, intercourse with his fellows—all these, more necessary now than ever, are in a large measure denied to him. The gifted amateur historian, among whom must be counted, in this context, all but a few priests and religious, can no longer fill the place he had in late Victorian days. A Gasquet, a Morris, a Thurston and a J. H. Pollen could not now exert the same influence.

There are moreover peculiar trials for the priest or the religious who is ploughing a lonely furrow. Men of action and administration are apt to regard him as one shunning the real things of life, or as pursuing a hobby. He will be fortunate, if sooner or later, and sooner rather than later, he is not called forth to be useful, to stop a gap in a school or a parish, and to stay there. He himself will have a demon within disguised as an angel of light, a voice to ask, in those days of loneliness and frustration that come to all scholars, whether he is justified in standing aside from the labour and heats of the day, from the direct service of souls, whether his work will ever have issue, whether in fine it is really worthy of his priestly vocation. He may remind himself, if he will, that no less an authority than Pope Pius XI proclaimed in an encyclical that fine scholarship was in the modern world the most efficacious of all apostolic work. He may remind himself, also, that he is seeking for truth, and hoping to communicate it to others. 'What,' says St Augustine, 'does the soul desire more ardently than truth?' Are we to hope, and to expect, that the work upon English church history will always be done for us by a Maitland or a Stenton? Should we be content to enjoy without effort of our own the wealth of learning and sober criticism that comes to us from the historians of Louvain, of Toronto and of Paris?

## THE NATURAL SCIENCES

## I: In Catholic Higher Education

By GEORGE TEMPLE, F.R.S.

Sedleian Professor of Natural Philosophy in the University of Oxford

N SEPTEMBER 1958 it is proposed to hold a conference of Catholic university teachers and clergy to examine the current problems connected with the higher education of Catholics in seminaries, universities, and technical colleges. The purpose of this article is not in any way to prejudge the findings of this conference but to arouse interest in the special problems of scientific education and to give a preliminary airing to some of the relevant questions. The discussions must inevitably include a survey of conditions in the higher forms of schools and of the intellectual climate in Catholic homes.

At the present time powerful financial, economic, and political arguments are being strongly pressed to encourage a much larger proportion of students to study the various branches of science with a view to its industrial, technological, and military applications. At the same time there are trenchant criticisms of the standards of scientific teaching and equipment in Catholic schools, and a certain suspicion that the atmosphere of science is discouraging to the growth of culture and religion.

Now, although there is no such thing as Catholic science, any more than there is Catholic mathematics or Catholic engineering, there is clearly a strong case for Catholic scientists to consider these arguments, statements and opinions with a view to offering advice and guidance to our own educational authorities.

There is indeed a special reason why Catholic scientists should concern themselves with these matters. As Catholics we claim to be the inheritors of a catholic culture, a perennial philosophy, and a revealed theology. We should therefore be in a position to give the problems of scientific education a discussion which is comprehensive in its range; balanced, moderate and just in its views; and sane and inspiring in its conclusions.

Vol. 232. No. 476.

ar in

avel urse e in

ian, few late

H.

the and

real

e, if

orth

stav

ngel

ion

side

e of

t is

f, if

ned

the

elf,

t to

ore

the

y a

out

hat

of

The proportion of boys in sixth forms who are studying scientific subjects rather than classics, modern languages or history has considerably increased and is said to be over 50 per cent. Specialization in any subject has a tendency to weaken the power of appreciating other subjects, but this tendency may be especially noticeable among scientists. There seems to be a common language and a community of interests in a Faculty of Arts, which can be noticeably absent in a Faculty of Science, where communication between the different branches is becoming increasingly difficult. This process of divergence begins at school and it is therefore of the greatest importance that it should be prevented at school. A general training in both scientific and 'human' subjects is needed to initiate interest and to sow the seeds of wide general culture.

This is impossible so long as school curricula are dominated by competitive examinations for university scholarships and there is therefore a strong and urgent case for the revision of methods of selecting entrants to universities. The traditions of Catholic schools should, however, place them in the forefront of a move-

ment for a genuinely liberal education.

It is too late to undertake this task at a university. The type of one- or two-year course in science which has been proposed for arts students is inevitably doomed to failure. The paucity of time available will compel the method of instruction to be descriptive and dogmatic rather than experimental and speculative; and the treatment will be elementary, selective, and superficial where it should be deep, wide and thoughtful. Scientific courses for university students in the Faculty of Arts can be successful only if they follow and build on a general education in fundamental science at school.

The association of science with a materialistic philosophy, avowedly atheistic and actively secularist, is now realized (in Western Europe) to be by no means a necessary or permanent relation, and it is now almost a platitude to say that the study of science is not inimical to the Faith. But it does appear to be sadly true that a narrowly exclusive study of a specialized branch of science can darken and close the eyes of the mind not only to the vision of the supernatural, but also to the claims of all humane studies. This perhaps is the main problem for next September's conference.

### II: In General Education

### By E. F. CALDIN

Senior Lecturer in Chemistry in the University of Leeds

THE universities are in turmoil because of the great increase in the number of students that is to be expected by about 1965. About two-thirds of the extra students are to be scientists and technologists, on account of the national needs shown in the White Paper on scientific manpower.1 This influx raises considerable problems about the teaching of science in Catholic grammar schools;2 but if these problems can be solved, the numerical shift should help to bring the proportion of Catholics who reach the university up to the proportion of Catholics in the school population. At present there appear to be proportionally too few Catholics in the universities, and this may well be related to the fact that children of manual workers form a smaller proportion of undergraduates than of schoolchildren.3 The many Catholic grammar-school boys who come from modest homes should find fewer obstacles to a university course in science than in arts, since a home background where books and conversation are taken for granted appears to be a less important condition for success in science than in languages or history.

The general education of scientists is an unsolved problem that is beginning to engage the attention of all concerned with their training.4 It may be admitted that the teaching of science at universities too often approaches mere technical instruction, and that little is done to encourage other interests. The narrow habit of mind has become ingrained in many students while still at school, where the attention given to literature and other broadening studies in the sixth form is often perfunctory. Admittedly the young scientist's mind usually expands if he stays on for two or three years of research, as many do. But the fact remains that the opportunities of a science degree course as a training in rational thought are often wasted; many of the young graduates have

Scientific and Engineering Manpower in Great Britain (H.M.S.O., 1956).
 See L. Connell and A. Willbourn, The Tablet, 19 April 1958.
 Report on applications for admission to universities, R. K. Kelsall (1957).
 See e.g. the recent Policy Statement of the Science Masters' Association; and the issue of the Universities Quarterly for August 1952.

learned a body of knowledge, but not the methods of enquiry that produced it. The great potential educational value of science is, presumably, that it is a rational discipline, with a rational method, which youthful minds can readily grasp; they can appreciate its search for evidence, its use of interpretation, its unity of theory and practice, its demand for imagination, analysis, humility, and integrity. It might be hoped that by inculcating the principles of a rational method, one could lead the student to develop rational habits in all spheres of life, as well as in science. But this transfer will not be achieved, it appears, unless he is made familiar not only with concrete examples of scientific work but explicitly with

the principles of its methods. And this is seldom done.

The most hopeful way of filling the gap at the university (and perhaps also at the schools) seems to be to develop the teaching of the history and philosophy of science. By giving an account of the logical structure of science, one can show the kind of knowledge that science attains—the point of view it adopts, the kind of explanations it reaches, and hence the kinds of question to which it is relevant. It then becomes evident that there are problems to which the method of science is not applicable, even in principleproblems of ethics, for example. A historical treatment is best adapted to young scientists; it is possible to show in concrete terms the emergence of the scientific kind of question and distinguish it from the questions asked in other disciplines. Moreover, the obvious way for scientists to approach the history of thought, and serious literature generally, is to study the history of science from this point of view. To give a history of scientific thought in its proper setting requires nothing less than a survey of the changing climate of European thought and literature, and the contributions to it of Greek, Roman, Jewish, Islamic, and Christian influences. To interest a young scientist in such studies is to show him the roots of western civilization and to give him an incentive to read its greatest works.

to

tł

I

B

ir

d

n

No doubt we cannot expect quite this kind of course in English universities; indeed in the hands of an aggressively atheistic or marxist lecturer it might do more harm than good. But we can welcome any course that stimulates the curiosity of undergraduates about the development of the leading ideas and the kind of explanation used in science.¹ Such courses have also been

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> I have in mind a course on the origins of science given by Professor S. Toulmin at Leeds for the first time this session.

used successfully in the last two years at school; and Catholic schools might well be expected to excel at courses of this kind, if they chose to develop them. The same methods can moreover be used to interest 'arts' specialists in the principles of science, a need which many people consider to be as pressing as that for the better education of scientists.

#### **TECHNOLOGY**

Some Thoughts on its Place in Society

By JAN SIKORSKI

Lecturer in Textile Physics in the University of Leeds

TT IS a truism that technology has for over two hundred years been making a most direct impact on the social structure 1 of the western world and has profoundly affected our way of living. Yet numerous discussions have revealed that there are many C tholics who adopt a regrettably indifferent or negative attitude towards the moral, social, and educational aspects of this interaction. The indifferent attitude could be summed up as 'leave it to the specialists'. It is suggested, by non-Catholic as well as Catholic thinkers, that the consequences might well be the realization of 1984 or of Brave New World. Thus Bronowski believes that 'a world run by specialists for the ignorant is, and will be a slave world. By leaving science to be the vocation of specialists they are betraying democracy, so that it must shrink to what it became in the decline of Athens, when a minority of educated men governed . . . slaves.' Our stake is greater than mere 'democracy'. The negative attitude stems from the view that it was the unholy union of godless technology with capitalism which brought to birth the new creed of dialectical materialism.

Is it necessary to say that both these attitudes of mind are highly irresponsible and utterly untenable for Catholics? For ours must be a positive and, above all, an active approach, enormous

though the dimensions of the problems are. We must keep ourselves well informed about all its aspects and resolve to be at least more vocal, taking example from the ardent followers of other philosophies. It is not enough to echo G. K. Chesterton who, in answer to the taunt that Christianity has failed to produce a just social order, retorted that it has never been tried. In fact, we should take heart from J.U. Nef's work, Cultural Foundations of Industrial Civilization, which shows the great consequences of the charity and compassion brought into the temporal world by the work of St François de Sales and St Vincent de Paul, during the time when industrialism was generating in the minds of men (at the juncture of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries). These men were outstanding in their epoch and have had no equals. Successive ages have produced their great humanitarians, but the forces which have combined to form our present industrialized social pattern have had as their objective the machine; workers have been 'hands', not personalities. It would be naïve to suggest that we can change the economic order at this stage of human development, but we must be concerned intimately with the essential requirements of those who sustain it.

A fairly recent study of 'working-class' life in this country, by R. Hoggart, reveals a distressing picture of '... "faceless-culture" in which mental and spiritual vacuum begins to spread with the acceptance of all values as relative'. On the other hand, in their Study of Attitudes to Factory Work, S. Wyatt and R. Marriott suggest that people are reasonably happy in their work, even when this has little intrinsic interest, provided that conditions are good and that they are well treated and adequately paid: but they agree that there are other unconscious factors which determine attitudes to work. These considerations emphasize the great need for the proper education of the younger generation of Catholic technologists. At most of our universities they must rely on their Chaplaincies to give them guidance in moral and social questions. In at least one instance known to this writer, this is done at a regular study

group.

The discussion of the educational aspects of our problem must be preceded by some general considerations, as there is some confusion in the minds of many about the position of technology, an applied science, in relation to other branches of human knowledge. During the last ten years in particular there has been a constant stream of argument designed, apparently, to prove the superiority of humane studies, pure sciences or even social sciences over technology. This situation had been attributed by Sir Maurice Bowra to the inheritance of 'the Greco-Roman attitude towards activities which involve an admixture of the common needs of life. The engineer was thought to be somewhat sordid and engaged in tasks below the dignity of a civilized man'. This concept of a 'white-collar job' is, of course, much alive; it reminds one of seventeenth-century France where barriers existed in the economic sphere to preclude the entry of a member of the ancient nobility into trade or manufacturing. It is not possible to attribute this prejudice against the vocation of a technologist to a single cause. Is it because the general standard of vocational education is below that in (for example) science, or because 'liberal' elements are missing from the education of technologists? The first problem is one of great complexity and we will return to it. However, as the second criticism originated in the humanist camp, it is interesting to quote Sir Eric Ashby, who believes that analogous elements 'are missing also from a good deal of so-called liberal education'; and according to James Killian, 'the scientist knows nothing of the liberal arts and regrets it, while the humanist knows nothing of science and is proud of it'. It is now evident that the leading educationalists, in particular those in daily contact with teaching on both sides of the great divide, have recognized, with Sir Charles Morris, that 'the shouting match between the opposing sides, though it still seems to command a hearing in some circles, is really out of date'. Indeed, there are now many who, like W. S. Beck in Modern Science and the Nature of Life, maintain that there is no dichotomy between humanism and science: 'the fields of learning are surrounded ultimately only by illusory boundaries-like the "rooms" in a hall of mirrors'. In the end, these exchanges may be due to the lack of a common platform between science and arts. Walter James believes that 'the breach needs to be healed not only in the world of letters but for the sake of industrial efficiency itself', and Sir Alexander Fleck goes even further to call it 'an arid debate on the rival merits of science and the humanities as educational disciplines', and continues, 'I cannot help feeling that any controversy which might be allowed to develop on these lines can at best be irrelevant and, at the most, actively harmful to the interests of this community'. Little wonder that Professor Ubbelohde calls for 'the marriage of Art and Science', which one hopes will not be only le mariage à la mode.

A dispassionate assessment of the standards of technology in this country, both of various industries and in the educational institutions of academic status, is hardly possible. For the few who dare to criticize what is evidently inadequate in some branches of our industry are immediately belaboured with arguments about the alleged superiority of the traditional 'knowhow'. These arguments are upheld by unscientific managements. supported by ignorant outsiders who regard constructive criticism as an attempt to belittle the great tradition and achievement of the Industrial Revolution. A remark which this writer heard as a student (nearly thirty years ago) illustrates the gap that exists in this country between the 'pure' and applied sciences: first-quality products, it was said, require a British physicist, a French designer, a German engineer and an American production engineer. The textile industry, in particular, with the notable exception of its scientifically-conscious sector concerned with regenerated and synthetic fibres, could serve as an illustration. There was an almost incredibly long gap between the appearance, at the end of the eighteenth century, of the pioneering giants of textile technology (all of them from the North of England), and the beginning, after the First World War, of the uphill work of a small band of scientists to initiate a new revival, almost too late to recapture the lost lead.

Conceding that there has been a deficiency in numbers, the next step would be to enquire whether there was something lacking in the quality of technologists educated at the academic level (for these should set the pace for the whole field). In fact, some educationalists have asked whether it is possible to educate in three, or even four years, technologists of a standard of knowledge and maturity comparable to that normally found in the Continental and American Institutes of Technology, where five or even seven years studies are often involved.1 Perhaps, without too great simplification, the argument could be reduced to an elementary economic question: is it a better proposition to subsidize directly the education of undergraduates for a longer time (with the prospects of more mature and adaptable young technologists), or do we prefer to continue an indirect subsidy in the form of lowered efficiency in industry, which becomes saddled with the responsibility for the further education of new entrants? From

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Walter James, Progress, Vol. 46, No. 257, 1957; also N. Clarke, The Bulletin of the Institute of Physics, March 1958.

our point of view, there is much to be said for favouring the arrival into industry of technologists with some degree of maturity not only in scientific knowledge, which is a conditio sine qua non for finding a common language with the technicians and the workers, but also better equipped with other elements of vocational education, to fulfil an indirect Christianizing mission on the shop-floor, However good the arguments supporting the extension of studies at the academic level, there are, at least at present, no prospects of adopting such a scheme; the most urgent needs for increasing our scientific manpower will have to be met at all levels.

It may be suggested that the decision to expand the facilities of the existing departments of technology at our universities. rather than follow the continental and American example and increase the number of technical colleges elevated to advanced status, 1 has been forced not only by economic considerations, but primarily by humanists aiming at their ideal of the universality of knowledge. Indeed there was a very significant, though now almost forgotten, precedent connected with the beginnings of one of the red-brick universities. Lord Kelvin, acting as the chairman of a committee discussing its draft charter, rejected most emphatically a suggestion that the foundation departments of technology should be relegated to form a separate college, and that the university should be concerned exclusively with arts and science; in his view the reciprocal action of technology on the other branches of learning is of such value as not to be missed.

There is, however, some danger that the setting of standards for technology students in the early and most fundamental stages of their training in science departments may be somewhat biased towards providing what may be appropriately called 'second-best'; there are some who still believe that the admission of students of technology in great numbers will reduce the standards of the universities. One feels that some provision could be made for scientists to be seconded from industry to give courses of applied mathematics, chemistry and physics for the technology students; evaluation of the standards required would

be reached correspondingly quicker.

Whatever changes are before us in technological education, Catholics cannot expect to have a great influence on these developments. However, there is much scope for more frequent exchanges of views on the subject of technology, run on the lines of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See the White Paper on Technical Education (H.M.S.O., 1956; Cmd. 9703).

the recent Sheffield Conference organized by the Newman Association. There must be much more discussion between Catholic teachers of science, the social sciences and technology. There should be a panel of travelling lecturers available to the chaplaincies, where systematic discussion groups should meet; Catholic industrialists and managers, particularly those who approach the human problems of industry imaginatively, should be invited to lecture. Students should be encouraged to spend at least a month every year in industry, even though this may not be a requirement of the syllabus at their university; it is essential to develop a symbiosis of theoretical and practical knowledge. There have always been two systems of vacation work in industry: (i) organized vacation courses, a rational extension of university education, carried out under the close supervision of a particular concern whose officers keep an eye on possible new recruits; (ii) work at various stages of production in a semi-skilled or even skilled capacity. This writer had experience during the early thirties of both types of vacation work in several countries on the Continent and would suggest as most beneficial a balance between the two. For although the first method of training yields quick results, there is something to be said for the 'toil-and-sweat' road of learning the facts of industrial life. We ought to encourage students to make full use of this important method of self-education. The possibility must be also explored of organizing, through Pax Romana, vacation work for some of our students on the Continent.

These very limited practical observations may appear out of proportion to the general picture of an era in which technology has a role of ever-increasing importance. The overriding consideration is that technology, like all human activity, is but a means to an end. The matter is summed up very well in the following words of Nef:

The future of industrial civilization is likely to depend less on the scientists, the engineers and the economists, than upon the renewal of the search for the perfection of the human personality... independent of the values of mass production, automation and atomic energy. The qualitative resources of the human soul and of the human heart are more diverse, deeper and more inexhaustible than our contemporaries dream.'

# CATHOLICS AND THE STUDY OF MEDICINE

#### By BERNARD TOWERS

Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge

ATHOLICS appear to form a relatively small proportion of the medical undergraduates of British Universities. No accurate figures are available, and one can rely only on impressions; but in the author's brief experience of four Universities it has seemed that, despite the fact that Catholics are said to represent some 12 per cent of the general population of the country (and probably the figure would be much larger in the undergraduate age-group) only in the University of Liverpool did their number regularly reach even 5 per cent of the total number of medical students. The observation is surprising, particularly since, in view of the special appeal which the practice of medicine ought to have for Christians, one might even have expected the national average to be exceeded in medical schools. In the Universities of Bristol and of Wales (to speak again from personal experience) the numbers appeared to be smaller even than 5 per cent. Impressions, of course, might well be erroneous because, amongst undergraduates as amongst senior members of the University community, not a few powerful lights are carefully tended under good Catholic bushels; they might even produce, as a result, rather more warmth than some of those whose energy is expended more brilliantly. Bristol and Cardiff, it might be argued, are exceptional in that they tend to draw their members from predominantly non-Catholic areas. But in Cambridge, where there is little or no such topographical factor, the numbers, again, are far below what one might expect if there were equal selection from the population in general. Thus, out of an annual influx into Cambridge of some two hundred medical freshmen, there are rarely more than a dozen Catholics, and sometimes, it seems, no more than one or two.

The situation is somewhat different at the level of the practising members of the medical profession, but this is principally because of the large numbers of doctors who come to this country each year with degrees from Irish Universities. There is here, as elsewhere, an analogy between the calling of the doctor and that of the priest: the Irish Doctor (almost a national institution in England!) has played a role as valuable, in some ways, to the renascence of Catholic life in this country as his priestly brother. But if England is still in this respect an 'Irish Mission' it can be no one's wish that she should remain indefinitely so. It is high time we English Catholics produced enough vocations to the art and

profession of medicine from amongst our own people.

The loss of any deep sense of vocation amongst some members of the medical profession itself in the last fifty years might help to explain (at least to the more charitable and sanguine of observers) a possible lack of appeal of the profession to the modern Catholic schoolboy. The past half-century in Medicine has been par excellence the age of the Specialist, different in many respects from his forebear the Consultant. If the specialist, in the words of the old tag, is the man who 'knows more and more about less and less', the consultant was, and some would say should be again, the man who 'knows more and more about more and more': better informed, with greater experience and a more delicate judgement and skill; a better doctor, in fact, than his colleagues, but essentially primus inter pares; one who gives valuable opinion and the benefit of his skill to those that seek them, but who never normally takes over the detailed management of a patient unless it be, perhaps, for surgical operation.

This ancient view of the 'doctor-doctor relationship' seems a far cry from current medical practice in this country. We live in an era of Specialisms. So strong, indeed, has the cult become, that one has even encountered schoolboys who, seeking admission to read for a medical degree, have confessed (thinking, no doubt, to advance their cause) that they sought not so much to study and practise general medicine and surgery as to specialize in some minor, if more lucrative, side-branch in the profession. Now a vocation to heal the sick may be felt very deeply, and those who feel it most will probably speak of it least. But it is difficult to imagine a schoolboy's having a sense of 'calling', or even a simple healthy curiosity to become an 'Ear, Nose, and Throat Specialist', or perhaps a 'Rhinologist', to emphasize the modern trend. This is not to deny, of course, that any doctor might eventually and quite properly find that his primary vocation can best be pursued in

some particular field of study or application. But this is not how the sense of vocation is normally experienced by the young.

In the matter of specialization the wheel has now practically turned full circle. Today even the General Practitioner, if he sought to increase both his income and his social prestige, might with justice refer to himself as a 'specialist in psycho-somatic medicine'. This specialism looks at first to be no more than the latest territorial addition to the medical empire, but in fact it represents a rediscovery of Medicine as it was known to the Ancients and practised throughout the centuries. The increasing concentration during the past decade on consideration of the patient as a complete and indivisible human being, is no more than a return to a sound medical philosophy. In between we have had a period of exploration of many exciting individualistic pathways opened up by ninteenth-century mechanistic philosophy and by the application of true scientific methods to clinical problems. The result of these explorations has been an enormous and invaluable increase in our factual knowledge and understanding of some of the intricate correlations involved in the functioning of human beings in health and disease. As a result, the final synthesis of knowledge implied by 'psycho-somatic' will be, if and when it is achieved, a much more valuable one than any of the synthetic views of former ages. The complexities involved make this one of the most stimulating fields of modern intellectual endeavour. The profession needs men with vocations to this type of general medical practice. The General Practitioner of the future will then no longer be known as 'the backbone of the profession' (suggesting brawn rather than brain), but rather as both head and heart of a profession which will itself symbolize the finest integration of Art and Science.

It is just at this point in the history of Medicine that there is a real need for more Catholic medical students. The relative failure of Catholic schools to produce good potential doctors is harmful, not merely reflectively to the Church herself, but also, and in some ways perhaps even more important, harmful to the medical profession and to the community. The Catholic ethic, as Aquinas saw it, is psycho-somatic to the core, and is integrated within society at every level. Catholic students, if their education as children has been loyal to the authentic tradition and free from any taint of that ever-lurking heresy of the Manichæans, will find themselves in a privileged position from which to make, by dint of

true scholarship, significant advances in the future progress of medicine. Commensurate with the advantages given by Catholic faith and upbringing are the responsibilities not to neglect these talents but to use them for the benefit of all. Amongst doctors, the true Christian never fell prey to the prevalent view that his patient represented no more than the sum of his parts, nor did he imagine that effective treatment consisted of doctoring merely those parts discovered to be faulty-like a motor mechanic treating a faulty engine. It is now being realized, as well by the pagan as by the Christian humanist, that Disease is a process which affects the whole patient. Diagnosis and treatment are properly concerned with the ease and the dis-ease of the individual human being. It is the study of processes as they affect the whole organism that is of the essence of clinical medical science. This approach, constantly requiring both analysis and synthesis, is so thoroughly Catholic in the real meaning of that much-abused word, that it would be a great reproach to the Church in this country if her members failed to produce men with the intelligence, wisdom, and charity of outlook to help lead the profession out of the current maze of medical specialisms.

The low rate of intake of Catholics into medical schools in this country is probably due more to a lack of candidates with suitable qualifications rather than to any lack of professional appeal or of acceptance on either side. Here we meet the problem of the relative paucity, in Catholic grammar and public schools, of adequate teaching in the Natural Sciences. Entry to medical school is now nearly always by way of success at Advanced Level in Physics, Chemistry and Biology. Only in the one case, to the author's knowledge of the University of Liverpool, is it possible for a candidate to be accepted for direct entry into the faculty of medicine on the basis of intellectual achievement in any branch of knowledge whatsoever. The problems raised for Catholic schools, with their traditional emphasis on the Humanities, by this general requirement of a scientific education, is outside the scope of this

article and beyond the competence of the writer.

Of those Catholics who surmount the hurdle of entry, many undoubtedly rank amongst the best of their colleagues, and their successes within the profession speak for themselves. But on first arrival, when introduced to the basic medical sciences of Anatomy and Physiology, not a few Catholic freshmen manifest curious states of imbalance which one can only interpret as the unhappy

legacies of attitudes acquired in school towards the scientific study of Man. Imbalance may show itself as an undercurrent of reluctance to accept, or even properly to examine the findings of science concerning for instance the origin of man, or the peculiarities of the embryological development of his physical structure and its functionings. Such reluctance is sometimes accompanied by a deep suspicion of the motives of even the most transparently honest of scientists for promulgating their theories and findings.

of

se

nt

ne

ie

d

of

t-

ıl

ıl

Alternatively the undergraduate may, as if to show himself emancipated from 'obscurantist' notions, display an undue eagerness to accept without question and quite indiscriminately the writings of leading biologists whether they are dealing with science or 'philosophy' or, within science, with fact or fancy. Few seem to come up from Catholic schools with any clear idea as to what Science legitimately can, or cannot, achieve with regard to the understanding of the nature of Man. In particular, there seems to be a general failure to grasp the fact that in the application of the scientific method to the study of Man, just as of any other natural phenomenon, there are certain observational criteria and rules of logic which must be observed if progress is to be made. In playing a game of Association Football it is essential to observe the rules: no good can come if one of the players, faced with a difficult situation, expresses a preference for Rugby and runs off with the ball in his hands—unless, that is, his is the genius that invents thereby the game of Rugby! The question of the appearance, at some stage in the history of the world, of the biological organism we know as Man is one which abounds in complexities for the scientist, the philosopher and the theologian. It is a problem which a medical student can hardly help but ponder on. His University classes will approach this and all other aspects of the make-up of man from the scientific viewpoint. One would make the plea that the student be actively encouraged to pursue these scientific studies according to the principles which must govern good science, and not to deceive himself and others by bringing in, as 'explanations' of difficult scientific problems, truths established in other disciplines, no matter how relevant he may (rightly) feel them to be to the subject of Man, to which subject nothing that we know of can possibly be irrelevant.

The medical student, especially when he reaches the years spent in clinical studies in the hospital wards, has a very crowded

and all-absorbing curriculum. Clinical medical students are notoriously exclusive and 'professional' (in some senses of the word) in their habits of life. They tend to congregate together and to talk case-lore incessantly. All of this is clearly proper to clinical professional training, though one discourages it during those earlier years when the undergraduate should be enjoying an education concerning the basic nature of his future patients. Concentration of interest and effort on the work of the hospital wards tends to draw the senior medical student away from the activities of the general University Catholic Society of which, in former years, he was perhaps an active member. The man from the older Universities will already have taken his first degree at the end of his preclinical studies, and clearly the senior medical man is no longer at an equivalent stage of development with most other undergraduates. There is a real need, during these later years prior to qualification, for the formation of professional Catholic medical groups. Such a group should have as terms of reference for purposes of discussion much wider topics than those traditional problems in medical ethics such as abortion, euthanasia, artificial insemination, etc., however valuable and indeed essential is informed discussion of these topics. One would like also, though, to see studied and discussed, as being subjects of even greater importance, what one might call the more positive aspects of the relationship between traditional Catholic teaching and the practice of medicine. The conclusion would inescapably emerge from such study that, far from there being some inevitable 'conflict' between the two, such as one might conclude from perusal either of the popular press or of some standard texts of Moral Theology, in all but a very small fraction of cases current medical practice is thoroughly consonant with the highest Catholic ideals. A right sense of proportion is essential to a proper consideration of these matters. In the few instances where conflict does arise one can be sure that either the medical teaching is at fault-in recent years, for instance, advances in treatment during pregnancy have brought the profession much closer again than was the case a generation ago to the Catholic view of the sanctity of each individual human being-or, alternatively, that valid ethical principles are being misinterpreted or misapplied in the particular case. There is room here for searching enquiry.

One development which would, I think, be most welcome to Catholic doctors, would be a full treatment by theologians of what

no-

rd)

alk

ro-

lier

tion

ion

to

the

he

rsi-

re-

at

ег-

to

cal

II-

b-

n-

n-

he

ce

m

er

nt

one might call the Moral Theology of the Sins of Omission. This is clearly a subject much more difficult, because more intangible, than the ethics of Acts of Commission such as are normally discussed at length by the moralist. It is precisely the problem of not doing something (which by implication often appears, in the standard treatment, to be morally neutral) which weighs so heavily on the doctor's conscience. One would like to emphasize that even though the underlying principles might be wholeheartedly accepted there is always much intellectual and spiritual effort required if these principles are to be correctly applied in any given case. The resolution of a difficult problem in medical ethics is never the facile one such as sometimes emerges in the writings of non-medical casuists. Too many people, both without and within the Church, seem to imagine that Catholic doctors never have any real ethical problems to face, because their resolution is thought to be simply a matter of consulting an authority. The practising doctor at the bedside of his patient knows differently. Each individual problem, like the patient who presents it, is unique. The doctor is acutely conscious of his responsibilities both directly to his patient and before God.

Another part of the science of ethics which badly needs intellectual exploration by Catholic scientists and moral theologians is that of the morality of animal experimentation. Many of the greatest advances in the practice of medicine in recent decades would have been impossible but for large numbers of experiments carried out on animals. One can never know how or where the next important discovery, the next advance, will be made. But many medical scientists, actively engaged in experimental work, cannot help but feel gravely disquieted when they see carried out around them today an enormous amount of relatively random experimentation. Some continental theologians are well in advance of our own in their studies concerning the Rights of Animals, and in their analyses of the conditions which ought to govern animal experiments. By contrast, publications by Catholics devoted to the 'cause' of animals in this country often make embarrassing reading for the Catholic biologist, because of shallow sentimentalism. The publication of a mature analysis of these difficult problems is long overdue. Its effects would be far-reaching.

Space does not permit discussion of the place of Catholics in post-graduate work in pure and applied medical research and in Vol. 232. No. 476.

University teaching; doctors engaged in such work form a relatively small proportion of the whole. One will only comment that these are activities eminently fitting, activities where Catholics ought to excel, and sometimes do. The Catholic intellectual ought to bring to his academic work a standard of integrity and a degree of humility which are of inestimable benefit to the research-scientist. So too with teaching. Those same qualities should be in themselves a guarantee of intellectual honesty, and provide an adequate answer to those unhappy accusations, or mere suspicion, of proselytizing which might be levelled, even today, against someone in the University who does not conform either to the Establishment or to nothing in particular.

The future holds great promise, if enough candidates of the proper calibre are presented by Catholic schools for entry to the medical faculties of the Universities. The resulting benefit will be considerable at once to the Universities and the Medical Profession; to the Church and the general Community; and last but not least, as their studies develop through the years, to the students themselves. The pearl so freely given to each is indeed one of great price. It is the responsibility of each recipient to do

with it the best he can.

# CATHOLICS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

By MICHAEL P. FOGARTY

Professor of Industrial Relations in the University of Wales

THE author of a recent American study on piece-rates says he never found a Catholic who was a rate-buster. A Protestant might get out in front, chasing the high earnings and be damned to what the gang might think. But Catholics took the broad view. Human relations mattered to them as much as earnings. They stayed with the gang and were good union men. Something very like this, it seems, happens also with Catholics in the

social sciences. Misiak and Staudt, in their world-wide study of Catholics in psychology, almost fall over backwards in their effort to show that Catholic psychologists are merely psychologists who happen to be Catholic. But their evidence shows otherwise: Catholic psychologists do tend to concentrate on particular sorts of work. They are not, on the whole, in proportion to their numbers, the people who get out ahead and pioneer in new or highly specialized fields. But they do make a relatively big contribution to keeping the pioneers' work in perspective, to synthesizing it with the work of other psychologists and with work outside the psychologist's field. They haunt the border between psychology and philosophy. They are liable to study personality as a whole, or 'higher' mental processes such as judging, concept formation, thinking, and willing. They ward off the exaggerations of determinism, and show a becoming modesty about the limits of their science, notably about the psychologist's right to intrude on and reshape the personality of his neighbours. They do not mistake themselves for God. They prefer, in general, the broader

issues and those which touch closest on morality.

nat

ics

ht

a

re-

de

re

ly,

to

he

he

be

out

he ed

lo

A list has just been made of Catholics teaching in the social sciences (not only in psychology) in British universities, and the conclusions it points to are very like those of Misiak and Staudt. Catholic social scientists in Britain are, it seems, more likely than not to be rather practical and concrete, interested in how things actually, historically work out and in what happens at the point where 'is' meets 'ought'. They tend to take a wide view, geographically and in terms of their subjects. Some have chosen subjects broad in themselves, like education or anthropology. Anthropologists (or some of them) strive heroically to keep their field manageable, but cannot stop it being vast. Others take a narrower subject but cover many aspects of it at once, or take a world view of it. Many, whatever their subject, tend to skip back and forth across its boundaries, taking in practice all humanity for their field. A Catholic social scientist is likely to be the kind of person who can tell you how to run a school or an adult education class, to plan a community, to organize a parish survey, or to sort out a sticky problem of family casework or industrial relations. He might give you some lines on how to handle a case in court, if you count law among the social sciences. He may take you up into a high mountain and show you, for the moderate price of seventy shillings, all the kingdoms of the world and the national incomes of them. He

quite probably knows about community development in Pakistan. the social customs of Nuer tribesmen, Christian Democracy in Western Europe, British economic influence in the Far East, the rise of the rubber industry, or the social significance (which is considerable) of the trade in tin cans in Nigeria. He will very likely have, and publish, views on world population and food resources. and from time to time he may loose off an article on Christianity and social science or on psychology and free will. But one thing he is not likely to do, or not as likely as his non-Catholic neighbour, and that is to be a pure and particularly a specialized theorist. He is not likely, for instance, to have written the textbook of economic theory. There is as a matter of fact one outstanding Catholic name in that field, an American one, that of E. H. Chamberlin. But in general those who elaborate pure theory, in economics or otherwise, have to manage without us. And it is I think significant that Chamberlin does not teach in a Catholic college.

Now, I myself see nothing against this tendency for Catholics to prefer broad, synthetic studies, or to get as close as they can to the point of action, where moral issues arise. There is no particular reason why a Catholic social scientist should produce better work than his non-Catholic colleague in highly specialized fields. But one would certainly expect him to produce better balanced work, more catholic with a small 'c', less one-sided and a better guide to action. The Protestant genius seems to lie in pioneering, the Catholic, as witness the social Encyclicals, in synthesis. The special vocation of Catholic social scientists is to put catholicity into social science, and in the British universities they seem to be living up to

it.

But there are certain comments to add. First, though this is the special vocation of Catholics in social science, it is not the only one. Besides the vocation special to us, we Catholic social scientists have one which we share with social scientists in general. By all means let us contribute particularly in the more practical and synthetic fields of work. But we cannot always be synthesizing what others pioneer. Our standing in the profession depends also, and rightly, on what we contribute to pure theory and in more specialized fields; at the cutting edge of social science, you might say, the point where the major advances are made. Perhaps we have been too indiscriminate in drifting towards the practical and the synthetic. Other things being equal, no doubt, that is the best road for us to choose. But the Catholic social scientist who has a

gift for pure theory or for highly specialized, analytic work may well do his best for the Church, as well as for himself and society, if he follows that special grace which has been assigned to him.

Secondly, to put catholicity into social science is not the whole of even the special vocation of the Catholic social scientist. For some, there is a still more direct way of putting social science at the service of the Church, namely through the religious sociology movement, which has been slower to get off the ground in this country than on the Continent or in America. Many things in religious sociology can be done efficiently, in the long run, only through the official machinery of the Church. But much can also be done by candidates for the M.A. or Ph.D., or through local

studies in towns and parishes.

an,

in

he

n-

ely

es,

ity

he

ır,

Te

uic

ne

in

T-

at

CS

to

ar

ut

k,

al

to

11

d

And thirdly, granting that the central part of the Catholic social scientist's vocation is to put catholicity into social science, have we made a professional enough job of it? In some cases, perhaps, ves. Current debates on world population and resources, for instance, show far more understanding of the Catholic position than those of even a few years ago. The efforts of Catholic social scientists in Britain have had more than a little to do with this. I suppose no one has done more than Colin Clark to spread a true understanding of world resources and the process and possibilities of their development. And there was that statement by Fr de Lestapis to the World Population Congress at Rome, which has since gone round the world and done more than any other to remove misunderstandings on the Church's position on birth control. That statement began as a paper for the Union of Malines. Fr de Lestapis hammered out its first draft in the cellars of the Catholic Workers' College, under the auspices of Fr O'Hea, and I wrote what became the definitive draft. Fr de Lestapis and I were jointly responsible for the paper as finally issued. But even in the field of population and resources we Catholics have reacted to others' lead more often than we have taken the lead ourselves. In general, it is not we who set the pace even in those more 'catholic' areas of social science where we like to congregate. It is not our texts that dominate the discussion of international relations, of economic and social development, of fair pay or pensions, of community planning or child guidance or the reform of the elevenplus examination. There is for instance no text that ties up in a satisfactory way the traditional doctrine of the Just Wage (not forgetting the Just Fringe Benefit) with the large and rapidly

growing body of modern thinking on wage determination. All sorts of attempts are being made today to shape, out of the separate contributions of the various social sciences, a combined theory of the social group. They are throwing, incidentally, some interesting sidelights on cyclical and cumulative processes in groups. Building up from the theory of learning by individuals, we are beginning to have a theory of group learning which will explain the phasing of anything from a committee making up its mind up to the growth of managerial society. This should be just the cup of tea of those who want to bring synthesis and perspective into the social sciences. But it is not usually Catholics—nor indeed, it is fair to add, Englishmen of any other kind—who have written

the key texts and pushed this movement along.

Why is it that, though concentrating in the 'catholic' or 'synthetic' areas of social science, we do not give more of a lead there? Is it because there are too few of us, not more than forty or fifty in all the universities? I would be more convinced by that explanation if I did not find the same state of affairs in America, which is inundated with Catholic social scientists. Or is it, as Mgr Tracy Ellis has said of his American colleagues, that we are so busy trying to be like our non-Catholic opposite numbers that we have no time to work out our own distinctive contribution? I dare say there is something in that. There is something about a Catholic upbringing which does tend to make one a non-rate-buster, one who does not stick his neck out. We tend to avoid the pioneering fields where necks have to be stuck out ex officio, and I am not sure that we are too keen on sticking them out even to the less noticeable extent required to follow our special bent in the broader, more practical fields.

But I do not think that even the natural reluctance of Catholics to incur excommunication, be it ecclesiastical or social, is the whole of the story. There is something more. After all, we Catholic social scientists do, in fact, consciously or subconsciously, let ourselves be drawn towards the areas where our contribution could be most distinctive. But we do not get much guidance when we arrive there. Here, I think, is the real answer. There is no Catholic school in social science, no regular exchange of opinions which might make explicit, not only the kind of contribution that would be useful in principle, but also the areas in which it would be most profitable to get to work here and now. Even those of us whose field of work is most narrowly defined have some choice of

All

ed

ne

in

ls.

ill

its

d,

ad or xprojects within that field. At present each of us has to wander like a lost sheep in the desert, hoping to find the area that suits him best from the point of view not only of his professional skill and tastes but also of his responsibilities as a Catholic. I am not suggesting anything very formal. But if there were more exchange of ideas among Catholic social scientists in Britain, more of a common opinion among them, many of us would find it easier to choose profitably between the three areas of specialized or highly theoretical work, the 'catholic' field, and the field of religious sociology, and between the different lines of work open in each of these areas. As a new graduate, twenty years ago, I would have found a social science equivalent of the Newman Association's Philosophy of Science Group very useful in this way, and I would still as the head of a social science department today. Maybe we should follow that line up.

### SCHOOL TO UNIVERSITY

Problems in Sixth-Form Training

By MORGAN V. SWEENEY

Headmaster of St. Bede's College, Bradford

I sometimes wonder who has the worse lot, the policeman in the song or the master in the school. The schoolmaster is either blamed for not inculcating his charges with some branch of knowledge, or alternatively for doing it. He is blamed for preparing for examination, or scolded because his pupils do not get them; frowned on for easy discipline and damned for strict discipline. He should no doubt balance himself precariously on the razor-edge of the golden mean (even if this involves mixing his metaphors!), but I doubt whether his funambulistic abilities are so well developed. In no sphere is he so frequently attacked as on the preparation of students for University. His training of science students, he is told, is poor, for he gives them no philosophical grounding. He is specializing too much and too early, and his

students are far too materialistically minded, for they look on University education as a paper qualification, and not as a formation in life. Quite succinctly the University teacher has sometimes much the same opinion of the grammar-school teacher as the latter may have of the primary-school teacher. In less refined

circles this is known as 'passing the buck'!

The Catholic school is usually well aware of the problems of its pupils in after life, and perhaps only too well aware of its own defects and difficulties. Within this framework it sets out to prepare the sixth-former for University with the general aim that the pupils in the sixth form should be well prepared in their secular studies and in their religious studies and practice to benefit intellectually and spiritually from their University education. This aim goes further than the frequently voiced suggestion that 'the should be able to defend their faith', since I believe that this is only a palliative. It is at least arguable that apologetics have been regarded too much as either apology or last-ditch defence, when they should result in an increase of knowledge and deepening of knowledge already gained.

There is, of course, the possibility of 'integration'—a word beloved of all writers on education. We are called upon to integrate our studies, to see the connexion between them, perhaps even to range over them with the encyclopedic knowledge of St Isidore. I am not sure that you can administratively integrate a curriculum or should even try. The integration is in the individual, not in the syllabus. The study at the school of the philosophical, theological and moral aspects of atomic science is no doubt a fascinating subject, but it is not theology, philosophy or ethics, nor does it integrate them. As a very occasional exercise in the unity of knowledge, it could well serve to stimulate sixth-formers, but their actual experience is so limited that I doubt whether it

would have any real value.

We must, then, mould our courses very much to the boy we are teaching, following the age-old custom of dangling the carrot near enough to the donkey's nose to stimulate it into going forward, and not too far to cause it to lose interest. That is why the most successful religious teaching is adapted to the boy as you find him. No schoolmaster would pretend that this religious teaching of the sixth-former is adequate for the graduate, and one would hope that he would not try to teach him as though he were a graduate. There would be no problem if we could be sure that

on

ic-

25

ed

of

٧n

re-

ar

n-

113

67

en

of

the student would progress in religious knowledge as he does in secular, nor are we foolish enough to imagine that it happens in every case. University chaplains have an uphill task trying to do this, and their work is fruitful in a great many cases. I doubt whether we have any right to hope for more than that, and experience with the students of a college of Advanced Technology has taught me to be cautious in offering ready-made solutions. That a good number of students have been persuaded to make the effort is very hopeful indeed.

The school contents itself, then, with a sound course in Apologetics and perhaps a taste of philosophy in a course of Ethics or Social Ethics. These, over and above the value of their content, do introduce the student to clear thinking. The psychologists will probably doubt whether such virtues are carried over into other subjects, but my experience encourages me to believe that there is some effect. I do not think that a course in metaphysics or cosmology is suitable. The sixth-former is not ready for this, and, bace the scientists, the subject matter is rather too remote from his experience. A survey of history of philosophy is more than likely to degenerate into a series of notes to be learned. I would hope that the Apologetics course is not simply a preparation for an examination nor a string of debating answers to well-known difficulties. Such seems to me an insult to the sixth-former's intelligence. A good course in religious instruction given by a sympathetic and intelligent teacher can be a real joy and an asset to the pupil, not a book full of notes to be learned by rote.

Adequate time must be given for this, otherwise it will be dismissed as 'not likely to get me to University' and become a Cinderella subject. This provision is not easy. Universities seem at the moment to be engaged in elaborate 'double-talk', or perhaps they do not let their right hand into the secrets of their left. It is a favourite technique of Universities in their official capacity to lecture grammar schools on the iniquity of early specialization. Officially the grammar school agrees. Each departs to his own sphere, the University to make its scholarship papers and faculty entrance requirements stiffer, the grammar school to add an extra period to specialized subjects. It is quite obvious that just as long as Universities make increasing demands, so will specialization increase and multiply. A survey of education in other countries shows that they have a longer University course, but whether this is the solution in England, I do not know. It seems obvious that

the 'bulge' already pressing on the grammar school will soon be clamouring for University entry, and I very much doubt whether the University will submit to the overcrowding which is becoming more general in the grammar school. I do not intend to enter into discussion of the problem, but simply to note the facts. I can say, however, that the head of a grammar school has to be quite firm and strong to resist the attractions of enhanced scholarship results and insist on the needs of Christian education. Sometimes I think I am in the position of the dog walking on its hind legs. It is not wonderful that I do not do it well, but that I do it at all.

Perhaps this is the place to mention another problem, that of results. It might be framed: 'to get distinctions or not'. In this atmosphere of highly competitive University entry it is a great temptation to 'spoon-feed' the willing and intelligent boy or girl. It is easier for the teacher and it requires little more than the willing participation of the pupil. It should not be a disappointment if quite a number of them are dropped from the honours school at the end of their first year. This is a problem, since ideally the sixth form is a time when there should be definite and progressive training in working on their own. Encouragement to read beyond their notes, to see problems and think about them should be the ideal sixth-form teaching. This process is much more difficult than spoon-feeding, but I am firmly of the opinion that it is the essential training for the University course. It is for this reason that I am against the potted answer in the religious instruction. Sixth-formers have to think about their religion, and in my experience they are much more likely to question the conclusions of religion than those of secular subjects. That is why a reasonable amount of time is necessary. There must be discussion of difficulties and resolution of doubts. Echoes of Abelard's 'haec est fides orthodoxa' have a place and are necessary, but can be positively dangerous without rational assent.

So far I have spoken only of the intellectual side of sixth-form work. Quite obviously this is only one side of the story. There is a moral aspect of the sixth form whose development is likewise vital to the successful education of a potential entrant to the University. The sowing of wild oats is a proverbial occupation, but it is the ambition of every headmaster to ensure that the variety sown is not too wild. To this end there is a change in the disciplinary attitude to the sixth form. They are no longer boys, but growing very quickly into men, and the object must be to tide

them over the difficult transitional period. Schemes of prefects which enable them to take a limited amount of responsibility, a general attitude of trust, and, most difficult of all, some considerable moderation in their regard of the attitude common to all schoolmasters of 'it is right because I say so' are all part of the training in the use of freedom. Most of them will only learn the hard way by abusing freedom, yet, despite the schoolmaster's natural desire to preserve them from the pitfalls, they must be given this opportunity. It is a truism to say that often the abuse of freedom is a greater teacher than restraint externally

applied.

Yet this is not enough. Most heads have realized that despite retreats, and occasional descents on the sixth form to urge them to have zeal for the faith, the school most often cannot succeed in implanting in its pupils that enthusiasm for their faith that causes them to make great efforts for it. In general this seems to be caused by that well-known feeling in the student that they know their head has to say this. A great advance has been made in this sphere in recent years by the Leadership Courses for boys and girls run by Fr Bernard Bassett, s.j. Boys return from these courses filled with new zeal, talking of new facts of faith they had not seen before, realizing above all that there is plenty of work for them to do as laymen, and that they can start that now. It is, of course, only for picked boys, but there is no reason why these should not act as leaven in the school. The tone and attitude of a school is really set by the boys in it, and I have always had a preference for the change of heart that comes from among them, rather than that laboriously applied from above.

So far I have discussed the internal problems of the school, but the picture is not complete without some idea of the external problems, the old problem of money, staff and the general Catholic body from which our pupils are drawn. There has been some discussion lately about the science teaching in Catholic schools, generally speaking in a condemnatory sense. I think we can leave aside here the questionable statistics, and consider the difficulty of expense, a topic which is never far absent from any discussion of Catholic schools. We are only just emerging from a period when Catholic education of grammar-school calibre had to be conducted as cheaply as possible if many Catholics were to take advantage of it. Science was often at a minimum because it was so expensive, but it is well to realize that the fact of Catholic scientists

shows that it was not entirely neglected. We share with non-Catholic schools the present difficulty of securing science teachers, and though new laboratories are being built and old ones modernized, every headmaster wonders whether he will find enough scientists to make them anything else but expensive show-pieces. The training of priests and religious as science teachers can overcome this difficulty, but this both takes time and brings us face to face with that other great problem, the insufficiency of vocations. Whether we have missed our great opportunity or not, I would prefer to leave to the historians. The office of prophet is glamorous.

but without divine inspiration not very rewarding!

The Catholic body from which our pupils are drawn is only just becoming sixth form and university-minded. In fact it has taken some time for it to become grammar-school minded. I would tentatively date the keenness to take up a grammar-school place among the majority of Catholic parents to the last eighteen and perhaps twenty years. Industrial depression, a keen appreciation of the need to earn, and little or no appreciation of the benefits other than pecuniary of academic work have all been general among the majority of our Catholic population. Most day grammar-school teachers will tell you that at least 60 per cent of their pupils are first-generation grammar school, and that a tradition of grammar school has not yet been established. It is highly probable that the boarding-schools are reaping the harvest of the sons of fathers trained by the grammar school in the last generation. Even when a grammar-school place is taken up we still find the lack of realization of the necessity of concentrated work, of the importance of the sixth form among parents. We are quite frankly selling the sixth form on purely materialistic grounds. Parents can understand the possibilities of a career for their sons that is better than their own, although I do not think they are yet convinced of its potentialities for their daughters. This may account for the materialism that has been complained of by Catholic university teachers. All this is a slow process. It is quite obvious that we have not got all the boys we would wish for in the sixth form, and they are not all as receptive of the training we try to give them as we could wish. I suppose we are training somewhere about 5 per cent of the Catholic population in our sixth forms, which is a reasonable average if we are to keep the standards high.

There is one final problem which has some bearing on all this.

The bulge in population is upon us, and there are many indications that the Catholic population is settling down at a new and higher level. There was nothing more calculated to reveal our deficiencies in grammar schools than this. It is true that all the grammar schools in the country are now beginning to suffer from overcrowding, but they have at least the hope that in ten years at the outside they will be relieved of their temporary burden. Catholic schools are likely to have it as a chronic condition unless we can build new grammar schools and extensions of old ones to meet the need. It is, I am sure, quite unnecessary for me to dilate on the difficulties created by the overcrowding, or even to ask the perplexing question: 'Where is the staff to come from to bring the forms back to a normal size?" There are happily signs of new grammar schools being built and old ones extended to meet the need, but with no grant and a regime of money restrictions the difficulties are very great indeed.

es.

to

IS,

I have tried to outline what the Catholic school is trying to do for its sixth-formers and tried to sketch in hurriedly the difficulties it is working against. I have no doubt the Catholic head does realize the problems he is facing in his training of the sixth form, that the training that is given is but a means to an end. The end is the educated Catholic who has been given the tools to live a good Catholic life and die a good death. No matter whether the emphasis is on science or arts, that fact will always remain true, and it is the pursuit of that aim which gives the school stability as an institution. Without that the school will merely flit ineffectually from theory to theory, from idea to idea. Ultimately the hope for the Catholic graduate is that the school will have done its work well and effectively.

## THE TRAINING OF CATHOLIC TEACHERS

By A. C. F. BEALES

Reader in Education in the University of London

THE professional training of Catholic teachers in this country today is almost twice as old as Catholic higher education in the Universities. For when the Hierarchy's ban on the latter was removed in 1895 the Catholic Training College for men, at Hammersmith (today at Strawberry Hill), had been in existence for some forty-five years; and the first of the colleges for women, St Leonard's at Wandsworth, had begun in 1870. Today there are three men's colleges, the De La Salle College at Hopwood Hall dating from 1947 and Manresa from 1952; and ten women's colleges. The total number of students-in-training is about 500 men and 1500 women. All of these are United Kingdom students, save about fifty (from Eire and the Colonies). At the end of the present academic year the Jesuit teacher-training at Manresa College is to be transferred to Oxford.

Throughout the greater part of the century of development the severest of all problems facing these Catholic Training Colleges was of course financial. They operated in the same administrative context as the schools; at first they came under the Elementary Code; they began with merely building grants and pupil-teacher grants. After 1902 they enjoyed the new Balfour basis—that is, maintenance costs, once the site and building were found by Catholic money and kept in external repair. Today they are subsidized under the principles of the 1944 Act.

It is the more to their credit, then, that from the beginning they have been able to hold their own, academically, with the other denominational colleges and the secular municipal colleges, despite their financial disabilities. At first, in the dismal days of the Revised Code and payment-by-results, all the Training

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These are: St Paul's, Newbold Level, Rugby; Endsleigh Training College, Hull; Mount Pleasant College, Liverpool; Digby Stuart College, Rochampton, S.W.15; Sedgley Park College, Manchester; Cavendish Sq., W.1; Coloma College, Wickham Court, West Wickham, Kent; Maria Assumpta College, Kensington Sq., W.8; Southampton Training College; and St Mary's, Fenham, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Colleges crept in and crawled: i.e. down almost to 1900. But even during these decades the reports of the denominational Training College Inspectors—as given in full in the annual reports of the Catholic Poor School Committee (since 1905 the Catholic Education Council), and in the volumes of the Newcastle and Cross Commissions—bear impressive witness to a vocational zeal and professional standards of performance as striking as the material disadvantages that fettered all concerned. And as the courses the Catholic students have always taken are commensurate, and the examinations they sit identical, with those of all the other Training Colleges in the country, their pass and distinction lists show how indeed they have held their own.

Their great strength today is, as it always was, the homogeneity of their life, in an atmosphere of unified study and dedicated career, generated from the very start by the Religious who have formed the core of the staffs. Right down to 1939 one Training College in every three in England and Wales was denominational: that is to say, anchored to a religious trust-deed, and centred on the college chapel, with religious education an integral part of the course, and the course itself something of a real formation. But how far the curriculum of study in the Catholic colleges was truly 'integrated', or is so even today anywhere at all, is still a prime matter for investigation.

It has also to be borne in mind that Catholic teacher-training in this country today is still overwhelmingly non-graduate. Only one of our Catholic colleges is entirely graduate: Cavendish Square, in London, whose students take externally the Postgraduate Certificate in Education of the University of London (formerly the Teacher's Diploma). Some of the other Colleges, notably St Mary's, Strawberry Hill, produce each year a few graduates who have taken the one-year course alongside the non-graduate rest of their college. In other words, practically all the trained graduates teaching in our Catholic Grammar Schools today were trained in one or another of the twenty-four University Training Departments.

This reflexion raises the question of a Catholic graduate Training College as such, and whether it should be large, and whether it should be mixed, and so on. Such an issue is today no more a matter of practical politics than the parallel issue of a Catholic University in this country. Discussion on it is no doubt aligned precisely as on that twin-issue. There is much force in the

argument as to how far the teacher trained rather than formed must lack edge to his vocation, just as only a Catholic University education could make available a deep grounding in Catholic theology and philosophy such as we laymen deplore having had to seek for ourselves. There is irony also in the contrast that, automatically, every Catholic non-graduate teacher is trained in 'teaching religion', whereas of the Catholic graduates in our Catholic Grammar Schools none are (unless they had taken the initiative themselves). Further, there is only one Catholic Professor of Education in the whole country, and few University Readers.

But there is great force also in the counter-argument that England and Wales are mission-countries, that secular and civic duty requires the Catholic to give of his best (a transcendental as well as an academic and professional best) in the country at large and no longer in a 'safe' ghetto, and that an adult Catholic layman cannot be at once a hothouse plant and a spiritual shocktrooper. I myself would venture the generalization that the Catholic graduate teacher, through his four years in one of our secular Universities, is on the whole a fuller personality than he would otherwise be, to say nothing of the extent to which he is accepted, and able to do more in his 'extramural' apostolate, and in his professional associations. Nor do I find any regret among Catholic graduate trainees that a University Training Department was the only kind available to them; though it is probable that the majority of them, up and down the country, do then prefer to take posts in Catholic schools—despite (and all honour to them here) the manifest limit, in the Catholic Grammar School world, to their professional advancement, through closed shops and closed headships.

The integration of the curriculum, to make it more truly representative of what one finds in Cunningham's Pivotal Problems of Education or Fitzpatrick's Towards a Theology of Education; and the situation of Catholic graduate trainees, are, then, two live matters for discussion in our contemporary setting, after the turn of the first half of this century. A further issue has emerged very quickly in the last two years.

This is the problem of the three-year course, whereby from 1960 onwards the two-year course in all Training Colleges is to be extended by a further full year. It is under very heartsearching debate at this moment. The Ministry of Education's pamphlet on

it, issued last year, is inevitably tentative and general. The authorities of Training Colleges are getting together both regionally and denominationally, to explore and plan. Scylla and Charybdis have duly loomed up: more and more about less and less, versus less and less about more and more; specializations versus smatterings; breadth versus depth; concentration versus elbow room. It is doubtful how far the students themselves declare the need for a third year (for what, say some, the students' opinions may be worth anyhow). It is not unlikely that among the results may be one not promptly forseen: that, feeling the future difference between three years in a Training College and four years in a University to be significantly less than the difference hitherto between two years and four, more and more students will opt (in this welfare age of substantial grants) for University degrees and training, with all the concomitant advantages tangible and intangible. If this happens, it will not mean that all the aspirants will get in, for the pressure on University places is fierce; but, to the extent that they did, the Training Colleges would be losing more and more of their 'cream'.

How widespread such an attitude is I do not know. If it is at all common, it prompts the further question of how far, by implication, the student sees the professedly Catholic college and the professedly neutral University as 'not all that different': which would seem to steer discussion back to the more fundamental matter of ethos. As to this, from what I know of the Catholic Training Colleges, their difference from the others is beyond cavil. It is perhaps spectacular. And it comes to rest, as it should, in what the outside world at least regards as a real integration. As one of my non-Catholic colleagues put it, examining with me in a Catholic Training College: 'The point about these places is quite obviously that they do know why they're doing what.' In so far as this is true, it gives them the master-clue to that reshuffling of lectures and seminars and essays and special exercises and teaching-practice which will duly be called three-year-course reorganization: a clue which many of the rest of their colleagues may well envy them.

All this, however, is very far from saying that our Catholic Training Colleges had nothing to learn from the outside world. Their great shortcoming until quite recently (though they were not alone in it) was their isolation and insulation. They were separate little worlds, in the same way that, before Hadow and

Vol. 232. No. 476.

ed

lic

ad

0-

in

ur

he

0-

ty

ic

as

ar ld

d,

ic

ne

e

d

Spens, elementary and secondary schooling were separate worlds. There were paper links, and links through inspection; but practically no interpenetration of one another, still less interpenetration with the secular training world, since there was no real machinery that would make any of this possible. The Catholic colleges' sound notions of integration round a core of study stayed inside; new teaching methods (and methodology, being technical and neutral, is for the profit of all who care to have it) might not get in at all. The profession of teaching, at large, was

thus doubly the poorer.

The remedying of this situation, in the last ten years, is surely the greatest single factor in the professional progress of our colleges today. It centres, of course, on the development of Institutes of Education throughout the whole country. When the McNair Report on the Training of Teachers (1944) put forward two alternative schemes for really grouping the training of teachers in the several regions round regional centres, one alternative was subsequently to be a deal-letter: that of grouping the local Training Colleges under Joint Boards. For such Boards were not unknown already, but had not in fact met the difficulties of isolation. The other alternative, of grouping all the training, graduate and non-graduate, round a University, whereby all the colleges in the area should form constituent parts of that University's federal 'Institute of Education', has now been universally adopted, beginning with the University of London Institute of Education, which came into existence in 1947 and is today a federation of some five graduate and thirty-three non-graduate colleges, of which six are Catholic.

The benefits accruing from these Area Training Organizations to all parties concerned are already quite palpable. Professionally, while the graduate and the non-graduate qualifying examinations at the end of the respective courses are still different, they each and all imply one and the same 'qualified teacher status'. Socially, as well as athletically, the colleges form a community: though very much more in theory as yet than in practice. There is the local Committee of Principals. There is representation on the Academic Board of the whole Institute. There is membership of the various specialist subject-panels, which have each its channels of communication upwards through the hierarchy of Institute and University government and policy. There is cross-fertilization through visiting lecturers, and courses of lectures, and examining,

from fellow-colleges. The smaller the Institute, the more real its life as a federal community. The larger the Institute, the richer its academic resources in personnel for mutual benefit.

ds.

ac-

ra-

eal

lic

dy

ng

it)

/28

ely

ur

of

he

rd

of

a-

he

re

of

he

i-

of

te

ê

From this, the Catholic Training Colleges will be the first to proclaim that they have benefited enormously. It is for others to say, and they do, that the tangible participation of these Colleges in the academic and professional life of the area has enriched that life at large. And the moral in this, for at least one other aspect of Catholic higher education, namely the relationship between the Seminaries and the Universities, needs no pointing.

Since the days of Cardinal Manning and W. G. Ward, the psychological bent of Catholic authority in many of these matters has become resolutely extroverted. Nor is there much doubt that the results have justified the risks taken.

The risks were that the quintessence of Catholic youth might lose its Faith by exposure to a national climate of higher education which, still actively anti-Catholic in 1850, had by 1950 become something worse—apathetic. The actual casualty-lists from these risks cannot be large. When we deplore amongst ourselves the leakage problem, are we thinking to any significant extent of losses amongst our intelligentsia, or of clerical vocations? Surely not. In higher education the risk has been 'contained'. And the result, as regards our Training Colleges, is quite remarkable, in that Catholic teacher-training today is more a part of the national organization of pedagogy, with a fully two-way traffic in ideas and practice, than the Catholic schools are yet part of the national system.

Nowhere, moreover, is the positive side of this interpenetration—the contribution which the trained Catholic as such can make in his own academic circle—more valuable than among the Catholic graduates training for teaching in the Universities. For in the University world there is not only that mixture, of all religions and none, which is common at every level of the national life; and not only our centuries-old tradition, of English pragmatic progress and philosophical quietism, but also an atmosphere of complete equality and freedom and fellowship, in which a man's colleagues are indeed apt to respect him more if he does speak from what convictions he has than if he does not. This is true among both students and dons; and to the extent that (according to the former) it is becoming rarer among the latter, it is bound to be refreshing and stimulating.

The Catholic graduate-trainee in a University Education Department not only has the advantage of a past grounding that is coherent, but in his seminars and discussion-classes he shows it. Amid a prevailing chaos of educational philosophy, that is an immense asset, even if only (and literally) for the sake of argument. If it is vital for people to realize that education is not a question in vacuo, and indeed that the question What is education? does not validly arise at all until some prior attention has been paid to the prior question What is man? Then it is the Christian graduate-trainee, and the Catholic in particular, who is most likely to ensure that this, and the host of other kindred points that we find in our manuals of moral philosophy, will not be overlooked by those in whose company he is being trained. On the whole, the Catholic graduate-trainee is in fact shouldering his responsibility in these vital ways. Granted his tutors tend to find him a 'model' student in some of the negative ways as well: overdeferential (especially the women), too kind to tutorial authority; even when it verges on Jacotot, too prone to assume that College Catholic Societies exist for undergraduates such as they are now no longer, and so on. Granted too that Catholic pundits, for their part, discussing the higher education of their young, are wont to blame our own Sixth Forms for sending up too many of their undergraduates spoon-fed and half-baked. But many things are relative. Despite their shortcomings, the Catholic graduates in a College are relatively the best off, and therefore able to give, in the currency of clearer thinking, and going where a principle leads, and having an open mind in Chesterton's sense, of periodically shutting it again, like the mouth, on something solid.

How many of these graduates there are, compared with the 2000 in the thirteen Catholic Training Colleges, is anybody's guess. They do not all join the graduate wing of the University Catholic Federation (the Newman Association). If I have stressed them disproportionately, that is because perhaps they tend to be understressed in many discussions on the training of Catholic teachers. If, too, I have said nothing specific on the contribution of the Catholic dons in the Education Departments of the Universities, that is because their position is no different, save superficially in subject-matter, from that of all their Catholic colleagues. Of these Catholics training graduate teachers in the Universities of the United Kingdom there are today, as far as I

know, twenty-two.

#### A LETTER FROM IRELAND

that

rguot a ion?

Deen

tian

nost

that

ver-

the

his

find

ver-

rity;

lege

now

heir

t to

heir

are

in a

, in

iple

iod-

the

dy's

sity

ave

hey

g of

tri-

the

ave

olic

the

is I

ANY observers who are by no means unwilling to recognize the excellent qualities of Irish Catholicism are puzzled that it should be so strangely unliturgical in its forms of worship. The more forceful speak of us even as an unliturgical people. On the face of it it seems odd that a Church which held to its religion in spite of difficulties and whose religious life shows today many marks of vitality-the profusion of vocations to the priesthood and the religious life, the missionary expansion of the last fifty years—should seem indifferent towards the 'necessary source of holiness'. But so much depends on what you mean by 'liturgical'. The pastoral phase of the movement has helped to clarify the significance of the word as implying much more than concern for aesthetic or ritualistic details. Mediator Dei reminded us of the value of aspects of worship which had not been overlooked in Irish religious life, if insufficiently appreciated elsewhere. But it was the reshaping of the Easter Ordo that made the greatest difference of all, and the enthusiasm with which the restored order of services was greeted by a people believed to have no interest in such things made many reconsider their opinion. Time has shown no substantial diminution of that first fervour; nor have the clergy been behind the laity in their enthusiasm for Pius XII's great reform. It must be admitted that at the start many priests had doubts about the new regime, but once it had proved itself effectively in increased attendances at the services and at Holy Communion from Holy Thursday to the Easter Vigil, their support for it was beyond question. They have since co-operated well in leading their people into a deeper understanding of the great mysteries of our redemption. Beginnings have been made in participation; explanation of the significance of the services before their celebration has been very common; the priest-commentator during the services has been pretty general, and found to be perhaps the most helpful aid of all to the people's understanding of the liturgy of these days. I think it has been the experience in other parts of the world that the liturgical movement failed to recommend itself generally to priests and laity because it seemed to lay excessive emphasis on external participation and often sought to have it taken up before the faithful generally were prepared for it. The laity must first understand the meaning of the celebration and their role in it; they must be led to want to participate. Our experience of the Easter Ordo is likely to do that. It has certainly

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Our correspondent, the Professor of Pastoral Theology at Maynooth, is founder and editor of *The Furrow*.

brought about a very remarkable change here in our attitude towards

the liturgy.

This change of attitude is seen, too, in the development of the Liturgical Congress. Coming into existence at a time when the pastoral value of the liturgy was receiving increasing attention, the Congress was helped by the tide of enthusiasm for the restored Easter. Its very lateness in starting, as well as our insular position, fortified by a traditional caution before the new-fangled, saved the movement from the excesses that appeared elsewhere in the earlier phases. It was in 1954 that a group of priests came together to launch the Congress. The monks of Glenstal were the chief architects and they were aided by a number of diocesan priests and by some members of the staff of Maynooth College. The chief concern was pastoral; there has never been anything monastic about the Irish Congress except its superb setting in the prayerful atmosphere of Glenstal Abbey. It was not the work of a society; the aim of the organizers might be expressed—they were much too modest to issue a manifesto or anything of that sort—as to promote the pastoral study of the liturgy by the clergy so as to enable them to lead their people to fuller understanding of, and participation in, the liturgy according to the directives of the Holy See. All diocesan and religious clergy are invited and the attendance has been growing each year. This Easter a hundred and forty priests attended the two days' sessions. The presence of a number of priests from Britain and overseas each year has been very welcome; their experience and fresh viewpoint has contributed much to the discussions.

Little so far has been done in Ireland, it must be confessed, to lead the layman to a fuller knowledge of theology and in training for the lay apostolate, but I think the decision to confine the Liturgical Congress to priests was in the circumstances entirely right. We must commence with the clergy. Experience has shown too that liturgical congresses attended by laymen and priests without distinction, especially if these are handicapped by being societies as well, fail to satisfy either laymen or priests and sometimes merely provide a platform for enthusiasts too eager for change or for those laymen who would like to drag the clergy along into step. The Irish Congress has very prudently avoided such mistakes, and its relations with the clergy have been good, as is evident by the growing attendances at its annual meeting. It has in a few years struck roots and has shown a distinctly Irish character. The selection of acceptable broad themes-this year the subject was 'The Eucharist'-and its prudent choice of speakers have made its influence felt more widely. The publication of the papers of the Congress in The Furrow has carried its message to the clergy at large.

For the past two years the organizers have invited some notable European scholars to read papers at its sessions and one must be grateful for these wider contacts. Dr Balthazar Fischer of Trier, who was accompanied by Mgr Johannes Wagner, Chairman of the German Episcopal Liturgical Commission, read a valuable paper to the Congress of 1957 on 'Experiences of the New German Ritual'. This year's distinguished visitor was Fr Herman Schmidt, S.J., Professor of Liturgy at the Gregorian University, Rome, who spoke on 'The Liturgical Structure as Reflected in the New Holy Week Ordo'. Fr Schmidt told me that he was much impressed by the Congress; he was especially taken by the common sense and down-to-earth quality of the discussion at the open forum. The work of the Liturgical Congress during the past five years has not gone unrecognized by the hierarchy. In a letter to this year's meeting Archbishop Kinane of Cashel, who has been Petron of the Congress since its inception, paid tribute to its work:

'For a long time we were hardly aware of the great liturgical movements on the continent of Europe, which were arousing such interest in the history of the liturgy and were helping many to participate more intelligently and devotionally in the public worship of the Church. There has been, however, a considerable change in recent years, due in large measure, I am confident, to the liturgical Congresses held at Glenstal. For helping so effectively to bring us into line with the general trend of the Church in this matter we are deeply indebted to the monks of the Abbey of SS. Joseph and Columba.'

Our chief pastoral concern here is the spiritual welfare of our people who emigrate in search of a living, the vast majority to Britain. Because of the freedom of movement between the two countries it has proved impossible to determine the exact figure, but a reasonable estimate puts the number of those who went to work in Britain in 1957 at 50,000 and the total of the Irish-born at present seeking a living there at 800,000. The effect of so heavy a drain on the life of our rural parishes can easily be imagined. Yet it is only within the last year or so that the problem has been receiving the attention so great a movement of population demands. Successive Governments have played down this tragic loss of man-power. Slowness to appreciate the pastoral and spiritual implications of emigration might be more easily excused for one side of it is largely beyond our juridical control. But a missionary Church is never satisfied with juridical pleas and justifications. A feeling of sympathy with our emigrants has been growing everywhere and with it a desire to give them every possible support and assistance. Too frequently their going has been spoken of as a sort of treason, bitter calumny to men and women who are led, as are the vast majority of our emigrants, only by the loving sense of duty felt by a daughter or a son towards his family.

The question has been keenly discussed during the past few months. following the publication of a special issue of The Furrow on the subject. At the invitation of the editor a number of English and Irish laymen and priests set down their experiences and views of the dangers and possibilities that confront the 800,000 Irish-born Catholics in Britain. Some of these findings were by no means flattering, and one article in particular, that of a young County Kildare man who went to work for some weeks as an unskilled labourer in Birmingham in order to see for himself how our emigrants live, provided matter for debate in almost every presbytery. Reilly reported, without attempting to justify it, that our emigrants in Britain speak of us Irish priests as 'snobs' and indifferent to the lot of the people, and that they contrast the kindliness and sympathy of priests in Britain, whether these are Irishborn or not. Another contributor stated that the young Irish emigrants regard the Irish priest as remote from their lives. 'Are our people,' he asked, 'beginning to look on us [Irish priests] as a caste with a huge influence, whom it does not pay to cross?' It is a cherished Irish belief that the priest has always been close to his people. It has not hitherto been questioned that the bonds are no less close today, indeed this is a common peroration theme at ecclesiastical gatherings. It is surely o their advantage that the clergy should examine their consciences on this basic pastoral relationship. We have done little, certainly, in the way of preparing our people for the difficulties and dangers that await them in a strange land, and hardly anything at all to make them aware of the apostolic opportunities that will be theirs. The Patrician groups, which are spreading in the towns through the country but hardly at all in rural parishes, are doing excellent work in leading numbers of people to the exciting discovery of their faith, but this is only scratching the surface. So much remains to be done in the field of education at all levels to develop the spirit of apostolate and make our young people proud of the possession of the faith. This matter of the vast Irish movement of population is much more than a problem of enabling young people reared in a country where Catholic values are accepted to preserve the faith in a strange land where these same values are daily questioned; there is here a vast missionary potential which in a few years has practically doubled the presence of the Church in Britain-almost a million Irish-born adults. Our task is to help prepare our people for that missionary task, and help as well by sending still more priests to Britain to serve the needs of the greatly increased congregations.

Such a programme naturally involves collaboration between the hierarchies of both countries and this has been in operation for some time. Beginnings were made, without any publicity, when a group of Irish volunteer priests, under the direction of the Columban Fathers from their headquarters at 30 Ovington Square, were assigned as

chaplains to Irish workers on large construction sites and to attend to some special categories in the London area. For some years Irish religious have been doing excellent work by conducting missions in various parts of Britain. Last St Patrick's Day Archbishop Godfrey, who has shown such interest in the possibilities of this situation, announced that negotiations were afoot with the Irish hierarchy 'to work out a scheme whereby it may be possible to have the help of Irish priests in those parishes where there are large numbers of Irish people'. In the course of the same address His Grace revealed that of the 455,000 Catholics in his archdiocese of Westminster 150,000 were born in Ireland. I feel certain that whatever measure the hierarchies approve will have the warmest support of priests here. At no time in our history have we come nearer to Britain—at the level of the people, I mean. With the priests and bishops of that island we share our people and that must surely draw us closer together.

J. G. McGARRY

# BELLOC'S LETTERS

## By ADRIAN HASTINGS

A man must carry his weight and fulfil his term

OME people write letters, some don't. While most of the great letter-writers have been men of leisure, people who otherwise composed little but used their correspondence as a chief and deliberate vehicle of self-expression, the busy scribblers of books and articles—finding in these more than sufficient outlet for their ideas—have shown little desire to carry the same activity into private life. To this Belloc was a striking exception. Often badly paid, always unsure of the future, financial needs together with a thrusting sense of mission forced him to endless public writing in spite of a temperament which at times cried out in revolt—'I was never meant to use words', he complained; it is a wonder that at the same time he still managed to pour forth a constant and fascinating flow of letters, full of good things—rhyme, humour, and above all a lively narrative of unceasing activity. These letters¹ were worth publishing.

Inevitably they do not reveal some new aspect in Belloc's life or

<sup>1</sup> Letters from Hilaire Belloc. Edited by Robert Speaight. (Hollis & Carter. 30s.)

character hitherto unsuspected. Their publication follows hard on Mr Speaight's fine biography, and he already had them all before him as he wrote. But they do seem to me to show us Belloc as he lived, at work, always on the move, better than almost anything else; and their content is never dull. Belloc was not a great imaginative thinker or philosopher, and indeed frequently claimed that his soul was as dry dust—'Of the higher things I know nothing. I was not called to them.' His strength lay in observation, be its object men, towns, the contours of a hill or the rise of the sea. It is always when describing things that he is best, fresh, most penetrating. His general judgements are less reliable. In these letters we have his observations at their closest and purest, and

that is a great part of their value.

It is a besetting sin of historians to neglect geography. On this score at least Belloc had nothing to confess. His value as a historian, and also as an observer of the human scene, came in large part from his tremendous sense of place and province, and his knowledge was firsthand. He knew the land because he had walked it. 'I always think that one of the few wise things I have done with my life has been-while I was yet able-to take those prodigious walks across the world: from the Pacific to the crest of the Sierras through Colorado, from Oxford to the Irish Sea, from York to Edinburgh, to Rome, from Toledo (slowly) to Toulouse, from the Basque country to Santiago: they do furnish the mind.' Here he is surely right; knowledge of the ground out of which history grew gave his work a value un-ruined by the distorting effect of his wildest vagaries and frequently a real gain on the studies of the professionals. Inevitably, as life went on, this fresh and extensive firsthand experience of the local geography behind events diminished, and his history suffered in consequence. Use of a motor-car, where previously he would have walked, together with an exaggerated passion to keep moving impeded sustained examination of any particular locality.

It should be said here that these letters belong for the most part to Belloc's later and less important period. They do not offer a balanced selection. This is hardly the editor's fault, though there are some omissions which it is difficult to forgive him. The fact that a letter has already appeared in some other work is no absolute reason for not including it here; nor has Mr Speaight consistently followed such a ruling. Why then refuse the letter to John Phillimore written after the death of Belloc's wife, or that to Chesterton on his conversion? They bear reprinting.

Still more important is the question of period. Belloc was an Edwardian—an Edwardian in revolt, an Edwardian prophet, still an Edwardian. All his really great work was done in the years before the First World War. Had he died with his wife in 1914, he would have lost forty years of life and twenty-five of sustained literary activity, but

Mr

n as

ork.

on-

hil-

t-

His

of a

e is

ale.

nd

ore

lso

re-

at

1

he would have left us strangely little less original and enduring work. Naturally and inevitably those who have written about Belloc knew him chiefly in the post-war years, years of maturity, refinement, charm, but seldom of creation. So it is with this collection; there are 300 pages of letters but almost 250 of them are from the years after 1914. There is little indeed remaining from the period of the great sonnets, of Danton, Robespietre, and The French Revolution, The Path to Rome, The Four Men, The Servile State, the series on British Battles. This is not to criticize the editor, for he has chosen from what he could lay his hands on, but it is to state a fact and a warning. Few men have so long survived the time of their original greatness as did Belloc, and these letters do chiefly represent that period of survival and not the all too brief heyday of his genius.

Belloc understood his function to be one of challenge to the accepted orthodoxies of the day, crusted orthodoxies inherited from a biassed Protestant past. Challenge is always the prophet's work, and there is always work for a prophet because there are always these crushing hangovers, the no longer thought-out assumptions derived from an earlier wave of thought and activity.

Whenever a crust forms it is the duty of me who loves Truth (and the love of Truth is the distinguishing mark between men) to prick or burst the crust. It just happens to be anti-Catholic now. It is the stronger for being anti-Catholic since the world is always against our Lord; and by anti-Catholic I don't mean consciously opposed to, say, the Immaculate Conception or the Homoousion, but anti-civilization, anti-it. Anti-wine, anti-laughter of a free sort, anti-love, anti-celibacy, and anti-pure stuff. But though it should cease to be anti-it, should the crust turn (once more) to be pro-it, pro-civilization and pro-right living, it would still be a crust and a divine necessity to stir it about would still be driving truth-loving men.

Behind this lies what seems to me a capital distinction—between the living function of a given teacher and the complete corpus of doctrine he upheld.

Take Belloc himself. Imagine him born, not in 1870, but forty or fifty years after, in the world shaken by the Chesterbelloc and Shaw and H. G. Wells, the post-war world. He would be faced with a different crust and a different mission, he would even discover—within the English Catholic community—an orthodoxy drawn from the opinions of Belloc himself. Entering into such a society he would not conceivably be materially faithful to all the causes and positions which in his own time he did in fact champion. There are in truth two types of fidelity possible in regard to the masters of the past. One is the material type: fidelity to Belloc will then involve a careful mastery and

justification of all the viewpoints to be found in A History of England or The Party System. This is the sort of loyalty very often found, but sooner or later it inevitably produces the reaction of total rejection. There is a different fidelity, less precise, less easily formulated, more functional. It involves a kinship of attitude towards contemporary society. One could agree with Belloc materially upon every point and still be, indeed for that very reason be, a part of 'the crust'; while one may disagree with Belloc here, there and somewhere else, and still share his

mission and appreciate his value.

This is a useful distinction and one which often needs to be made when we come to consider the sort of adherence we should render to the great figures of the past. It is one which can apply, for instance, to St Thomas. This is particularly important because we are instructed to be faithful to St Thomas and should know what that entails. No one, indeed, would suggest that we are bound to follow every opinion put forward by the Angelic Doctor. Nevertheless for a large part Thomists have tended to construe their fidelity to the master in a very material way. They carry on long discussions as to what precisely he intended to say on this point or that and intimate that by settling such a question they settle also that of objective truth. They follow his terminology with exactitude as also his ordering of doctrine, even the divisions into questions, articles and the like. Here we have a fine example of strict material fidelity to a great master. Certainly it is a valuable thing, and yet one may ask if of its nature it does not betray a deeper spiritual discipleship. St Thomas' literary method was the practical outcome of the academic system in vogue in his time. His interests, the problems with which he chiefly wrestled, were the problems which particularly worried his contemporaries. In coming to grips with such issues he set aside much of the traditional approach of the philosophers and theologians who preceded him, and constructed a new ensemble which took account of the knowledge new to that age and the literary forms then in use. Such a work was viewed with grave suspicion by traditionalists and even in part condemned. To stick for ever to his system, que system, his literary method, to preoccupy oneself with just those questions which he needed to tackle, would seem to respect the body but to kill the spirit of his achievement. The Summa Theologica was so completely contemporary a work that I find it difficult to believe that if St Thomas lived today his work would not be equally contemporary. Fidelity to St Thomas, the true fidelity of sense and thrust, is something far more difficult to obtain than mere ritual reproduction.

Loyalty to Belloc, in its own more humble way, should be of the same kind. We do him no service by a servile cult of his every word—something which he himself, especially as a young man, would have abhorred. What he can give us still is a great deal of inspiration and also an approach both to life as a whole and to the business of thinking; he

can help us not to be taken in by the ultra-respectable face of politicians, the ultra-scientific objectivity of the professional historians, the ultra-highbrow orthodoxies of modern thinkers, the octopus efficiency of big business. We need Bellocs now, but real Bellocs not pseudo ones; they are more hard to come by. It was one of the causes of his growing melancholy that he felt—not always reasonably—to be alone. There were a growing number of camp followers but few equals to stand beside him in the gap. One senses that very strongly in his letter to Mgr Knox. It is a call to share his mission—the bearing of witness to the truth before the non-Catholic world.

The men suited thus to affect the nation by written and spoken word are few: all are needed. Those whose effect is indirect through reasonably good living are numerous enough; but those who can decide the issue by direct appeal are a very small company, fluctuating even in their restricted numbers: and every one is needed.

Where Belloc perhaps went most wrong was in his practical identification of the Truth and Catholicism with a particular cultural and social pattern, and a certain attitude to a vast mass of questions about which Catholics may legitimately think very differently. At times this over-simplification certainly endangered the clarity and the efficacy of his witness to the essential, and it involved him in some indefensible positions, but they were only frontier positions and he knew that too. His heart was with the essential. Possibly the only great and enduring consolation of Belloc's life, at least apart from his family, was the conversion of some of his dearest friends to that essential-the Faith. 'I wish we were of one religion,' he wrote to George Wyndham, and one knows he meant it, but Wyndham never became a Catholic. Belloc's letters to him are some of the best in the book. The sudden deep friendship of the two men in middle life has a character of its own. Wyndham was just the right person for Belloc, quite as intelligent, very well balanced, with a kindred appreciation for earth. He was the practical -and successful-distributist, the reforming Tory concerned not with party politics but the land.

Though friendship with Belloc did not bring Wyndham into the Church, it was certainly a major factor in the conversion of Phillimore, Baring, the Chestertons. But his help did not end with conversion, which is after all the beginning of life not its close. Belloc helped to lead them in, and if he had not been about, roaring and urgent in championship of the Faith, would they ever have come? But, once in, their formation had still to continue. Here, I think, Belloc's help was of still greater value and we can see traces of it in some of these letters. The problem of converting people is often not so much one of presenting an appeal, solving objections and the like, as of offering a milieu in

which, once converted, they can feel reasonably at home. Now the wonderful thing about Belloc is that for his time and place and class, he was that milieu. He might not suit the present generation, being untouched by the whole modern Catholic revolution in liturgy, scripture study, and theology (had he ever read even the New Testament?) Nor certainly did he suit everyone of his own time and class. Nevertheless he did seem to present in himself a coherent intellectual and religious world in which thinking men could stroll about in confidence, could feel at home and grow in faith without acute cultural discomfort.

That in the end is the measure of Belloc's success. More than anyone else, he generated a society in which the Faith surged forth again with intellectual confidence, even audacity. Where hitherto Catholics had tended to whisper, Belloc always roared. Reactions, as he said himself, exaggerate. We do not need to roar today, but we have-and largely because of him-the confidence of a reasonably loud voice better suited to our times. In using that voice it would not be wise to stick too closely to the particular opinions of Belloc or any other of the founding fathers. But his mantle of a fighting man, of capacity for firsthand observation, of a huge sense of fun, and-best of all-of constant disrespect for the powers that be, is not one we can afford to cast aside. His greatest possession, of course, was simpler and far more valuable than all that. It was the Faith, the rock on which all his life and thoughts were built. There are few who seem to merit more than Belloc that simple title 'a man of Faith'. 'The Faith,' he wrote to Mrs Wansbrough, 'is Reality, and through it all falls into a right perspective. That is not a consolation-mere consolation is a drug and to be despised—it is the strength of truth.'

# **BOOK REVIEWS**

### PERENNIAL PHILOSOPHERS AND CHRISTIAN TRUTH

The Meeting of Love and Knowledge. Perennial Wisdom. By Martin C. D'Arcy, S.J. (George Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.)

EVERY scholar can be wise within degrees, but wisdom belongs more appropriately to one who has for aim to find ultimate meanings in the nature of man and in the universe he confronts.' Thus Fr D'Arcy, in the chapter which forms the core of this book. The attempt to assign value to human experience has ever been the mark of the man of wisdom in all the great cultures of the world. In the East, wisdom has rightly been recognized as belonging pre-eminently to those religious philosophers whose thoughts—the life-blood of countless millions over many centuries—are enshrined in the great religious literature of the East, in Buddhist sutra, in Hindu Upanishad and in Taoist manual. In the West, the decline of Christian belief brought with it an almost total elimination of value, be it in art or philosophy or in national and international relations. Instead of wisdom, de-Christianized Westerners sought information and techniques, and preferred the partial knowledge of science to a deeper discernment which reaches below the surface phenomena. Even Christians, in far too many cases, believed only superficially and did not integrate their beliefs into a practical philosophy of living capable of dealing wisely with every human situation as it arose. It is a great consolation to see in our own day this tide of Western infidelity to spiritual values on the turn, perhaps just in time to save us from the horrors of atomic warfare. Too many have seen through the attempt of the positivist to reduce philosophical speculation to mere argument about language and have sensed the modern philosopher's failure to answer the ever-persistent questions about life and death and human happiness. Too many have come to realize the limited powers of the unaided human reason and, as Fr D'Arcy puts it:

have turned away from the rationalists to consult Sartre and Gabriel Marcel and to discuss the primordial images of Jung and the wisdom contained in the myth.

Amongst the many movements away from the shallowness of much modern philosophy is that which seeks wisdom in all the great religious systems of the world. This is the path followed by the late René Guénon, by Ananda Coomaraswamy (to whom this book indirectly owes its conception), by Toynbee and, above all, by Aldous Huxley. whose book, The Perennial Philosophy, is the best commentary available on this religious quest. Huxley and his followers believe that, when sifted and examined, all the great religious writings of the world will yield a substantial kernel of truth which is common to them all. They are convinced that, in answering the basic questions concerning man and his life in this world, the Christian and the Buddhist and the Taoist and the Hindu are all in fundamental agreement, Combine through the Confucian Analects and the Vedanta and the Hebrew prophets and the Tao Teh Ching, and collating impartially the evidence of Muslim sufi and Christian mystic, they attempt to show that, in spite of varying traditions and historical accretions, there is a highest common factor of precious wisdom to be won from the great religions of East and West. It is this highest common factor, this perennial philosophy, which Huxley offers to spiritually starved moderns.

It is a tempting offer. Even Christians must admit that Huxley and Toynbee are asking the right questions, even if they are not giving acceptable answers. We must be thankful to Huxley and others for drawing attention to the fact that Eastern religious thought is stimulated by a profound pursuit of ultimate truths, however imperfect and incomplete we must adjudge that thought to be by Christian standards. Fr D'Arcy can truly say that a poem from the Bhagavad-Gita is so sublime as to be counted 'among the highest utterances of religion'. But in spite of all appearances and similarities, in spite of all the astonishing parallels that can sometimes be found amongst the differing religious traditions of East and West, and in spite of the seeming identity in the mystical experiences of a Ruysbroeck and a Hindu saint, there are many great divergences, particularly of motive and purpose, which Huxley and Guénon overlook. It is in pointing out these divergences in fundamentals that this book offers its greatest value. Fr D'Arcy points out, for instance, that Buddhist compassion and Christian charity are not the same thing, and he could have similarly treated the alleged identity in all aspects between Taoist effacement and Christian humility, and between the Universal Love of Mei-Ti and the agape of Christian thought. We can fully admire the wisdom of a Mei-Ti or a Ramanuja, but we cannot agree that it is identical in all respects with Christian wisdom. We cannot even agree that Christianity is one religion amongst many. For Christians, Christianity is Religion, pure and simple. All other religious thought, containing as it does valuable fragments of truth, awaits its completion in Christ.

Naturally enough, it is in the realm of mysticism where the per-

V118

né

tly

le

ennial philosophers scatter most confusion. We might reasonably be excused for not treating Huxley seriously on this matter of mysticism since he has so dangerously equated the ecstasy of a St John of the Cross with the heightened awareness induced by mescalin, but that would be unfair to the Eastern mystics who figure in his pages. It is in this rarefied atmosphere of mysticism where Fr D'Arcy's steadying hand is most appreciated. In a note to Chapter III of this book, Fr D'Arcy suggests that there are at least three forms of mystical experience, and Professor Zaehner's Mysticism Sacred and Profane can be usefully called in here to help us further on this matter. But the perennial philosopher is without a guide in these regions, for he lacks that certain knowledge which safeguarded St Teresa of Avila from misinterpreting her experiences during mystical communion with God. The language of a Hindu mystic and Eckhardt may be very similar, since both are agreed that the mystical experience is almost incommunicable, and such tentative explanations as are made are clothed in the terminology of love—a terminology notoriously liable to misinterpretation. The Hindu interpretation of union with Brahman involves the ultimate identification of the mystic with the Absolute. The mystic is merged with Brahman. He is Brahman. Hindu and Buddhist alike believe in their differing ways that the attainment of the highest wisdom-Moksa or Nirvana-leads to the extinction of the person. This is inadmissible for the Christian. There is an unbridgeable distinction between the Creator and the creature, a distinction which no mystical experience can obliterate, whatever one may feel during those timeless moments of exaltation. Fr D'Arcy reminds us how incompetent St Teresa felt herself to be in trying to express adequately the spiritual events which took place in her innermost soul, and how she relied on obedience to Holy Church to come to her aid. Fr D'Arcy writes:

Long experience has given the masters of the spiritual life in the East an empirical knowledge, amounting to a second sense, of how to behave in order to go forward. Aided by this they have dispensed with intellectual tests. In the West, however, there has been in the Catholic tradition the external test of right belief. Faith being an intellectual virtue governs spiritual experience, and therefore when the experience becomes mystical and above ordinary reason the intellect is not left behind; it is still active, making faith and experience coincide.

That is the real test for a Christian. Faith and experience must go hand in hand. The perennial philosophers are content with half-truths or, at best, half the Truth. For in St Teresa of Avila we see the meeting of true love and true knowledge.

In his final paragraph, Fr D'Arcy remarks that even if the attempt of the perennial philosophers is stillborn, 'that does not mean that Vol. 232. No. 476.

God has not revealed himself in sundry places and in sundry times'. On the contrary, it is the teaching of the Catholic Church that God does not withhold His divine light and grace from those who are in invincible ignorance of the Truth which is Christ. The Jesuits Ricci and De Nobili were ready to absorb all that was best in the cultures of China and India and, thanks to the efforts of orientalists, a still better opportunity is offered to missionaries today. If discontented Westerners are now turning towards the East in their search for wisdom, they may learn one day that many eminent Chinese converts have found their way to Christ through Confucius and the Buddha, and that many modern missionaries in India do not hesitate to deepen and sanctify Hindu theological terminology by using it to expound the Christian mysteries.

Fr D'Arcy deals charitably with the perennial philosophers—as befits a philosopher of love. Echoes of *The Mind and Heart of Love* are to be heard occasionally, but those who were somewhat daunted by that book need fear no similar intellectual struggle here. This is a relatively short book and one's only regret is that Fr D'Arcy has not found room to discuss the mysticism of Islam, since the theistic Muslim, unlike the monistic Hindu, preserves the correct distance between man and God. Nonetheless, in *The Meeting of Love and Knowledge* we have a lucid and compact treatment of a current of thought we should all be equipped

to discuss in the light of Christian wisdom.

MARK DOUGHTY

### YEATS AND HIS BELIEFS

W. B. Yeats and Tradition. By F. A. C. Wilson. (Gollancz. 25s.) Letters of James Joyce. Edited by Stuart Gilbert. (Faber, 42s.)

At a time when hostility towards the Church has been replaced—in the West at least—by despair, wistful indifference or curiosity, the phenomena of a syncretist faith based on a selection from the common heritage, Christian and pre-Christian, heretical and orthodox, becomes more noticeable than ever. This is a commonplace, but it is one that needs re-emphasizing in relation to Yeats and this latest book of Yeats studies, for Mr Wilson is not only a scholar concerned with elucidating a difficult text, but an enthusiast, a true believer in what Yeats himself called 'heterodox mysticism', the 'tradition' of the title.

Mr Wilson writes in his preface, 'My attitude has been frankly sympathetic in that I have found it less difficult than most writers to accept Yeats' cardinal beliefs, and this, I think, differentiates my book from much previous Yeats criticism.' Later, when acknowledging his indebtedness to Miss Kathleen Raine, he describes their friendship as

'hased on that perennial philosophy by which we both live'. Now this is something new in Yeats criticism taken as a whole, for most critics have been anxious to show that Yeats, more than Dante, Milton or Donne or other poets whose beliefs the critic does not share, requires from the reader today that familiar critical act-as far as his 'thought' is concerned-the 'willing suspension of disbelief'. This wariness was perhaps best stated by R. P. Blackmur when he described Yeats as hovering between myth and philosophy, unable to create except in fragments the actuality of his age. Yet in spite of this Yeats remains the most compelling poet to have written in English during the last hundred years. He is certainly the one to whom our threatened society responds most readily-one has only to think of 'The Second Coming', which to most people now has the familiarity of a sacred text, or 'The Circus Animals' Desertion'. And yet I feel sure that this response has nothing or little to do with a reasoned acceptance of the philosophia perennis expounded so eagerly by Mr Wilson and a great deal to do with Yeats' use of language.

The aim of the book is to deepen our understanding by means of a detailed examination of the sources of five of the later plays: The King of the Great Clock Tower, A Full Moon in March, The Herne's Egg, Purgatory, and the Death of Cuchulain. To this, the larger and more important part, is added a second dealing with certain lyrics which Mr Wilson thinks embody the same themes. These are: 'Shepherd and Goatherd', 'The Black Tower', 'Chosen', the two pieces on the Delphic Oracle, and 'Byzantium', to which last he devotes a whole chapter. This strangely eclectic choice is, I think, an example of the way in which

Mr Wilson's parti pris sometimes clouds his judgement.

We are by now pretty well acquainted with the superficial characteristics of the philosophia perennis: a heavy reliance upon the Neoplatonists of all periods, an equal debt to the various Indian systems, a respect for Buddhism-particularly the Zen system-and a fondness for mediaeval mystics such as Eckhart, Ruysbroeck and Boehme. To this must be added an acquaintance with Kabbalistic symbolism, an exaggerated regard for alchemy and perhaps a little Sufism and an awareness of the writings of the Chasidim. If Madame Blavatsky (who thought the Church of Rome was like a 'bramble bush' and the Greek Orthodox Church a triangle 'like all true religion') and the Rosicrucians have been somewhat misplaced by Jungian psychology since Yeats' heyday, they are nonetheless in the background still. If this seems disparaging, I would say at once that Mr Wilson's book is one that nobody who wants to understand Yeats' symbolism can do without. Although his emphasis on the occult side of this symbolical system leads him to underestimate the part played by Ireland in it, as, for instance, when he more or less dismisses the interpretation of Purgatory as a symbolic drama of Ireland's decay and the dissolution of the old

culture represented by Coole Park in the face of the rise of those 'base-born products of base beds' that Yeats so despised in favour of the No ghost plays and the Platonic theory of degeneration, he is nevertheless to be congratulated on making *The Herne's Egg*, for example, have a meaning beyond that of grotesque satire. He shows that Yeats made this veiled and arcane drama 'an archetypal play' out of a naturalistic legend, although here again it seems that to have any understanding of Yeats' kind of archetypal drama one would have to be an initiate of

what is more or less a mystery religion.1

The theme of the play is the union of the Self with the godhead which is the mysterious thunder-shrouded Herne at the top of his mountain. The means of this union is Congal's band of seven who consummate the union in their violation of Attracta, the Self. The Heme's that divine selfhood of which each individual self constitutes a part unless, like Congal (who, according to Mr Wilson, symbolizes rajas or passion), they refuse because they are pure self, which will not abandon itself to the greater. This reads, of course, like a distortion of the soul co-operating with divine grace and I think that we must feel free to include this among the undoubted influences, although Mr Wilson would tend to play it down as he does most of the elements Yeats took from Christianity. In a similar fashion, Mr Wilson sees Congal's six companions as 'the enemies' of the Hindu systems, which Yeats was studying and translating with Shri Purohit swami at this time, but he notices nevertheless that if Congal is then taken to symbolize Pride we have the complement of deadly sins. Yeats' fondness for this theme of the 'subjective' self as opposed to the 'objectivity' of the Christian revelation is well known, and as Mr Wilson points out the Herne himself is the white heron encountered in Calvary, and for which 'the death of Christ has no meaning' because the heron symbolizes the subjective life of the soul. This again has become a commonplace among more recent adherents of the perennial philosophy, reinforced as it is by the authority of Jung, who is never tired of telling us that Christianity pays too little attention to the dark, female side of our natures and too little attention to evil. Among the sources traced by Mr Wilson for this one play are Platonic and Vedic philosophy, Swedenborg, Samuel Ferguson's 'Congal', Plutarch's Morals, Balzac's Seraphita, the legend of the battle of Magh Rath and the corpus of belief Yeats had absorbed from Blake and the theosophists.

The treatment afforded The Herne's Egg is thorough, and Mr Wilson extends it to the other poems and plays which he examines with an erudition commanding our respect even if we cannot share the conclusions it leads him to. We might well ask, like the Boston Jesuit who questioned Yeats' theology which he found muddled and confused in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Yeats once wrote to Sturge Moore that he had always felt that his work was 'not drama but the ritual of a lost faith'.

ase-

less

e a

ade

stic

ing

e of

ad

his

m-

18

art

Of

on

nul

to

on

ok

ix

28

ne

re

of

n

h

Purgatory (and who has as a result become something of a Person from Porlock to Yeats admirers), whether in fact Yeats did have a coherent framework of beliefs. He had certainly assembled a vast body of disparate learning which in his poetry came to resemble belief. Mr Wilson would have us to believe that all these elements are to be taken seriously as statements of a reality that will survive the convolutions of the Gyres: that once we approach Yeats' poetry as a kind of vatic jigsaw puzzle to be solved we shall arrive at a deeper understanding of what life is all about. Mr Wilson tells us that he is 'deeply moved' by neoplatonic symbolism because it is the 'product of deep religious conviction'. To which one can only retort in Yeats' words, 'What then sang Plato's ghost, what then?' What indeed is he getting at? Yeats himself expected no more than a handful of the audience of his plays to understand what they were really about and he hoped that the greater part of it would be able to apprehend them in terms of Irish history and legend and in stylized mevement and rhythm. Mr Wilson throughout shows a certain fondness for this exoteric-esoteric distinction, and we may assume that this, too, is a characteristic of the perennial philosophy, a characteristic it shares with most heresies.

Mr Wilson disowns in his preface any intention of evaluating Yeats' verse as such and this is a pity, for on the one occasion when he does discuss it (in comparing the blank verse of the Death of Cuchulain with the rhythms of The Herne's Egg which he finds more vigorous because less of a dead-end and closer to modern speech rhythms) he is illuminating and displays a more evident critical sense than one would suppose from his enthusiasm for the symbolic system. Elsewhere, he can, in discussing a poem ('Byzantium' is the outstanding example), refer to a passage that does not fit into the scheme of symbolism as 'mere imagery', and this, I think, is a disturbing trend in his criticism. If Yeats' symbols were as archetypal as Mr Wilson suggests, the response to them by the reader must to a great extent be not wholly conscious in a way that is very close to the manner in which we respond to imagery. Many of Yeats' refrains, for instance, do not make immediate sense in relation to the explicit meaning of the poem (they are in fact rather like the questions and answers of Zen Buddhism and they may well have been influenced by Yeats' reading in that system), but in the total unity of the poem they contribute to a power that is not wholly capable of analysis into component archetypal symbols. This is a very obvious thing to point out, but I felt on many occasions that Mr Wilson was inclined to neglect the obvious when he was hot on the scent of some ingenious interpretation of sources. Nevertheless Mr Wilson has written a valuable book and it is significant that it should come from Cambridge where T. R. Henn (with whom Mr Wilson has worked) has for so long pioneered this kind of Yeats study, which provides the basis for a just criticism of Yeats as a poet and dramatist.

To turn from the complexities of Mr Wilson's exegesis to the Letters of James Joyce is a less abrupt transition than might be expected. The links between Joyce and Yeats were, as these letters show, personal and cordial. It was Yeats who obtained a Civil List Pension for Joyce during his difficult years in Zürich in the First World War and who later invited Joyce to join the Irish Academy of Letters. He had throughout his life a high regard for Joyce's qualities as a writer, although in one of his own letters he criticized Joyce for never being rid of 'his Catholic sense of sin', a view of Joyce which has by now become a cliché. Beyond this both men shared a common interest in cyclic theories of history, particularly that put forward by Vico; both in their different fashions saw the artist as hero and both developed a complex ambivalent attitude towards Ireland and its history which for both remained in some sense a symbol of the world—'allspace in a not-shall'.

These letters, assembled and edited by Stuart Gilbert, a friend of Joyce's middle years, begin in 1901 with a letter to Ibsen ('your wilful resolution to wrest the secret from life gave me heart . . . in your absolute indifference to public canons of art, friends and shibboleths you walked in the light of your inward heroism') and end in 1940 with a note to the Stadtpräsident of Zürich thanking him for granting Joyce and his family asylum in Switzerland. The years between are filled with the correspondence that has in extracts become familiar through the vast Joyce literature that has grown up since Joyce's death: the famous cards to Aunt Josephine asking for details of a vanished Dublin, the correspondence with Italo Svevo and Pound, the innumerable letters on points of style and on the long legal difficulties that attended all his books. The bulk of this collection, however, is devoted to the letters written to Harriet Shaw Weaver, without whose support Joyce and his family would have been unable to exist while Joyce wrote his books. It is these letters which reveal the depth of Joyce's devotion to the conception of the artist as hero which, if it is rarely explicit as it is for example in some of Yeats' letters, is everywhere taken for granted. Nothing must be allowed to hinder the work-not even the tragic illness of Joyce's daughter Lucia whose decline into incurable mental disease overshadowed the last years of his life. Reviews must be sent off, important people written to, printers reproved. Mixed up with all this are letters about the search for flats, for rest after the numerous operations on Joyce's eyes: he wanders about Europe until he reaches each Ithaca, a completed book.

Throughout these letters Joyce's lost faith recurs like a decimal point. Many of the references are sacrilegious or verging on blasphemy. Many of them are nostalgically playful, and yet it is, as these letters show, something that Joyce could indeed never lose, and it is this adherence, whether conscious or unconscious, to a system of coherent belief

tters

The

and

vce

vho

had

ter,

ing

OW

in

oth

da

for

ot-

of

ful

0

DU

ce

d

æ

that marks him off in many ways from Yeats, whose Protestant background, if Protestant it can be called, enabled him to emphasize private judgement and the union of beliefs superficially unrelated. There is no trace in these letters of the strange episode in Joyce's life (recently traced by Miss Patricia Hutchins) when he returned to Ireland from Trieste as representative of a cinematographic company shortly before the First World War. It is doubtful if Joyce, who certainly as far as languages were concerned was something approaching a pedant, would have approved of Mr Gilbert's method of presenting his letters to his children Lucia and Giorgio. They were written in Italian, the Joyces' family language, and have everywhere been translated. Only one specimen of the original is given and this seems to me a serious fault in an otherwise invaluable collection.

In both Yeats and Joyce it is possible to trace, certainly towards the end of their lives, a growing away from the world into a private system of beliefs and, in Joyce's case, of language:

The periwinkle and the tough dogfish At even-tide have got into my dish.

Although the movement of Finnegans Wake is, as we all know, circular, without beginning or end, and although Yeats looked for a new regenerated world after the cataclysm that would mark the end of this civilization ('and all things move in that unfashionable gyre again'), there is a quality in their work that seems to me without hope. The dark disasters of H. C. E. on one side, and the pride and coldness of Yeats' famous epitaph, seem to have only the short-lived magnificence of despair. Shri Purohit swami told Yeats that 'by analogy we endow God with a name', but for us God has a name and against the closeness to despair of these two artists, both in the their different ways great, both certainly embodiments of the mood of our age, we must hope, the one word from our cavern must still be, 'rejoice'.

CHRISTOPHER BUSBY

### A STUDY IN BAROQUE SENSIBILITY

Richard Crashaw. By Austin Warren. (Faber and Faber. 21s.)

IN a judiciously concise book of some 260 pages (published in the United States in 1939) Professor Warren gives a clear and illuminating account of the poet and his work, relating his subject lucidly to the literary and religious climate in which his peculiar poetic talent developed, and examining the poetry sympathetically yet critically; though it should be said at once that his analysis is open to dispute in certain important respects.

Richard Crashaw was born about 1612 and died in 1649, From Charterhouse he went to Pembroke College, where Arminian theology and 'High' Church ritual were in the ascendancy, and from there to Peterhouse, a college noted by its Puritan graduate Colonel Hutchin. son as pre-eminent for its 'Popish superstitious practices'. He became a frequent visitor to the conventual Anglican community founded in 1626 by Nicholas Ferrar, friend of George Herbert, at Little Gidding. and seems to have led a life of meditative piety at Cambridge until forced to leave by Cromwell's purge in 1643. Early familiar, doubtless. with much of the Catholic literature his Puritan father had so voraciously collected for the purpose of hostile destructive analysis, he was laid particularly open to Catholic literary influence by his friendship with the erudite and eclectic minor religious poet Joseph Beaumont, and long before his conversion he showed in his poetry the fascination for him of a number of popular Counter-Reformation themes (Mary Magdalen, St Alexis, St Teresa) and allied Baroque stylistic devices of which Southwell and the Anglican Giles Fletcher had already availed themselves. With Donne and George Herbert as forceful influences in religious poetry close at hand, the richness and variety of the influences pressing upon the young Crashaw must be considered almost overwhelming, and this not only in respect of poetic technique.

That there is good reason for aligning Crashaw with the 'metaphysical' poets of the century has been a commonplace at least since Sir Herbert Grierson's celebrated anthology and its accompanying essay. It is the other, in some degree stylistically contradictory, influences which, though no new discovery, have stood in need of more popular public demonstration. This Professor Warren excellently provides in his accounts of the Laudian Movement, the Counter-Reformation, and, especially, Jesuit Baroque Art-that summons to jaded senses and imaginations through the arresting techniques and appeals of a secular Baroque already called forth by those same senses and imaginations. The Spiritual Exercises with their bending of the imagination at full stretch on the subjects proposed for meditation; the popular books of Emblems with their implied acknowledgement of universal symbolic correspondences; the attempts to extend sense into fellowsense, and to transpose human affections into a divine key; and, at the back, a Catholic non-Puritan acknowledgement that 'the body, the senses, the affections, and the imagination are integral parts of man . . . [and] the lower may officiate as instruments to the higher': all these factors are clearly traced by Professor Warren and their relevance to Crashaw's poetry, with its accumulated conceits and its indulgence in the sensuous, is demonstrated. And the prior existence of secular Baroque influence-especially that of the Italian poet Marino (some of whose work Crashaw translated)-is made sufficiently clear for the om

to

in-

ea

til

58,

rahe

d.

13-

he

ac

ue

ÉT

reader whose attention is directed on Crashaw; though Miss Ruth Wallerstein, in her early review of the book, warned against taking the description of 'Jesuit Baroque' as adequate for 'Baroque' in general.

Crashaw's poetry is analysed and discussed succinctly and with ample quotation, his themes, his versification, symbolism and language all receiving attention. In a concluding chapter he is then adjudged a brilliant, intense and sincere, but limited poet of a largely devotional appeal which in his latest poems consists in a 'hypnotic' effectiveness for, and only for, a reader susceptible to such control 'through kinship in sensibility or through religious orientation or both'. 'In Crashaw the undeveloped and the overripe seem concurrently present. . . . He knew what it is to be a child and a scholar and a wit and an artist, but he did not know what it is to be a man.'

This is not the place for minute inspection of a verdict which must command a good deal of assent even from Catholic readers, but a considerable qualification must be suggested in respect of the total impression that emerges from Professor Warren's book. Though he is surely right in distinguishing Crashaw from Donne and Herbert in a number of important respects, he is, one feels, too much swayed by that very search for the Baroque (mainly a matter of theme, image, or conceit) which makes his book so informative, and he fails surprisingly to bring out that curiosity of mind and that allied feeling for, one might perhaps say, the 'sensible warm motion' of language, which repeatedly give his poetry a realistic native 'body' of remarkable fulness which is comparable with that of the great 'Metaphysicals'. It seems significant, and unfortunate, that of his 'Answer for Hope' only the following 'metaphysically' Scholastic ones are quoted:

The entity of things that are not yet. Subtlest, but surest being! Thou by whom Our nothing has a definition—

though 'Donnean', too, adds Professor Warren, 'is his simile [in the same poem] for the passage of dawn into day'. What seems to be overlooked is the quality which the following passage from the poem surely proclaims:

Thy generous wine with age growes strong, not sowre.

Nor does it kill thy fruit to smell thy flowre.

Thy golden, growing head never hangs down
Till in the lappe of loves full noone

It falls; and dyes! O no, it melts away
As does the dawn into the day.

As lumpes of sugar loose themselves; and twine
Their supple essence with the soul of wine.

In this kind of language lies Crashaw's admittedly intermittent but not infrequent strength. That the 'Nativity Hymn' with its unique tenderness and its stirring exaltation should be ignored in this book is also indicative of the leaning of Professor Warren's criticism and of its consequent limitations, for the 'Hymn' must surely be reckoned characteristic as well as great. The obscuring of this strength in Crashaw's poetic personality is the more unfortunate in that without a realization of it one may carry away from the few very bare facts of the poet's known life an unjust impression of personal feebleness and helplessness.

Yet it should not be thought that this defect in critical analysis is due to an uninformed or unfriendly response to Crashaw's Catholicism, though Professor Warren would appear not to be a Catholic himself. Throughout, the handling of Catholic doctrine and practice is understanding and sympathetic. At one point of the biography, however, a question emerges for a Catholic reader which seems to have remained hidden for others as well as for Professor Warren. Crashaw is known to have become a Catholic somewhere in or before 1646 and his progress from Paris to the household of Cardinal Pallotto in Rome and thence to his benefice at Loreto is firmly though minimally documented. Yet his biographers seem to ignore the question of the date of his ordination; though the Cardinal's letter of appointment (reproduced in Professor Martin's standard edition) addresses him as 'Sacerdoti'.

Notwithstanding, Professor Warren's book is a most useful one, and his purpose of elucidating and re-creating Crashaw's meaning is largely fulfilled, without ever becoming perverted to what he calls 'the purist aim of mere reconstruction'. It is to be regretted that the bibliography has not been brought up to date, however, for there have appeared since it was written a number of items which deserve inclusion.

F. N. LEES

### TRAVELS IN SPAIN

The Road to Santiago. By Walter Starkie. (John Murray. 25s.) The Cathedrals of Spain. By John Harvey. (Batsford. 35s.)

DR WALTER STARKIE, an indefatigible pilgrim in many fields, has always squinted at and fought authority as he would fight the evil eye of Big Brother, and his desire to solve the lifelong conflict between a Don Quixote on the move and a knight in the green mantle who nurses his patch in classical repose was, so he tells us, only found when he reached retirement. Whereas in former times he might have gone to a monastery, today he might even be suspect by the monks themselves, who would see in such a gesture but the last stage in the life of an in-

corrigible trotamundos. Hence he chose to join the multitude that has thronged the road to the shrine of St James at Compostela in Galicia. His account of the pilgrimages he has made is interlaced with stories and gobbets of information inspired by his itinerary across France, Biscay and Galicia. As a little philosophy for his pilgrim's scrip sits well upon a man who looks back over a full life, the author muses on the human desire to make a last journey through the countries that have warmed and fired our youth. A pilgrimage moreover expiates sin, and it was once a charity that begins at home to support one's neighbour on a pilgrimage and to give him release from his burden. Grants to this end from the guilds foreshadow travel grants now given to a different kind of pilgrim. The road to Santiago was held in such importance that many perks attached to the performance of the pilgrimage. Debtors on the road received a moratorium, professors on pilgrimage were excused by the constitutions of Salamanca from giving lectures, and Slovenian pilgrims who brought off the hat-trick were granted life exemption from tax.

The writer is also an enthusiastic pilgrim who goads into chattering life the things that he feels deeply—the Spanish friends he meets, the arrival of gypsies in the guise of pilgrims at Canfranc early in the fifteenth century, and the music of the twenty-four ancients over the Pórtico de la Gloria. The instrument in the vignette of Alfonso X is, however, the vihuela de mano, and the jug of wine is half empty, showing, as the author will agree, that music-making and thirst seem to have

been ever complementary.

The road to Santiago was also fraught with terror, and pilgrims were often beset with bandits and wicked landlords. Hence the original role of the knights as the protectors of all pilgrims. Everyone mixed regardless of rank on this road, which was likened to the milky way, so vast was the concourse. East met West. Scholars met in inns and hostels. Greek manuscripts were brought to the pilgrimage. Cultural interchange between countries, unaided by governments, sprang effortlessly into being. The propagandists of Cluny who were behind the first fine flowering of the pilgrimage were also the motive force behind the famous codex of Calixtus which might even bear a modern title: Come to Compostela! Starkie obeyed the call, not once but four times, and, wearing his scallop shell, he ascends the cathedral steps pulling his ubiquitous fiddle from its sheath to make his musical offering to the saint.

A pilgrimage helps to remind us that here we have no abiding city, and perhaps it was this thought of the mysterious uncertainty of terrestrial life, allied to the contemporary challenge of the mysterious Atlantic, that inspired the attraction of so many of these pilgrim sanctuaries situated on this seaboard, at Santiago, St Patrick's Purgatory and all the other shrines and holy islands that look westwards. Mr John

Harvey, who is a pilgrim in search of the hidden life of the Gothic world, also feels this about Santiago. The great cathedral, one of the three greatest in Spain, seems to have something marine about it so

that it might be called a cathedral under the sea.

Mr Harvey will have none of the myth that these buildings were put up in a kind of divine afflatus of communal religious effort. He gives us a mine of information on the individual designers, architects and masons, their way of working, and even the minutes of some of the meetings which preceded a new work or building. The play of competition as an economic factor is shown to be as decisive then as it is today. Mr Harvey also pays homage to the realism of the Spanish character, with its primacy of the theological. He traces this influence in architectural thought, and shows, for example, how the choir was placed at an easy remove from the sanctuary, the latter being considered far too important to be cluttered up with routine liturgy.

He has great feeling for the importance of site and for the colour of stone. He takes us with him across Spain in a three-pronged sweep. First he follows the pilgrims of Santiago along the route of their cathedrals—taking in the church of St Dominic of the Causeway, the engineer saint who helped build a better road for the pilgrims, and who was responsible for the miracle of the cock and hen, the story of which is told in some detail in Starkie's account. Mr Harvey turns south through Old Castile, leaving the professor to talk about St Firmin and Manolete, the priest-workers in France and St Thomas of Canterbury.

In their march south the cathedrals in Spain followed the Reconquest, and after 1492, when the Spanish crusade was won and its crusaders could concentrate elsewhere energies already screwed to the sticking point, Santiago and the building inspiration both went overseas, and there are many places and churches in the South American continent named after the saint. In Spain itself this new spirit was shown in Jaen, one of the last bulwarks of the Castilian thrust south, where the cathedral, according to the author, has something of the

Latin American spirit.

The Mediterranean also brought foreign influence to the building of the cathedrals. Masons from Lombardy influenced those in Catalonia. Both authors note that trade followed the pilgrim and the growth of trade in the eastern provinces and consequent development of the town seems to have swept the Catalan cathedrals into a sharing and manifestation of civic pride. Mr Harvey notes the Catalan economy in its use of the interstices of the buttresses. He comments on the amazing single-span nave at Gerona, the feeling for site and imperium at Tarragona, and he contrasts the dark velvety detail at Barcelona with the light, size, site and wonderful proportion of Palma, where the architect was also concerned with the appearance from without, so that the silhouette from the sea in the morning sunrise is unfor-

gettable. The writer is a contemplative and a scholar whose long look of praise at the Gothic lends him the grace of illumined statement. Thus Leon, the exquisite and the beautiful, with its incomparable glass, stands between the 'semi-romanesque of Chartres' and the 'secular brilliance of King's College Chapel'. Avila is a 'warlike bastion', while Segovia, the last to be built, is 'almost too orderly'. Burgos enthrals us at the approach with a 'unity of pinnacles and spires' rising against the sky. Salamanca has 'splendour and decorum', while Valladolid, claiming kinship with the Escurial, shows the same grimness of spirit that looked upon the world as a penitentiary.

Mr Harvey concludes by noting the influence of foreign craftsmen. He mentions again the ribbed lantern at Jaca, of 'undoubtedly Moorish origin', and he hints that this not only lends support to the theory of the basic unity of Saracenic and Gothic art, but that it rejects the thesis of the mechanical as opposed to the organic evolution of structures. An

idea that whets the appetite for another pilgrimage.

Those who know and love Spain have perhaps suspected much of all this but their debt is therefore the greater to the author for having prepared an exposé that progresses with the same sure cadence as the vaulting and arches that he describes. To read the book, with its 149 illustrations and plans, is to relive the memory of former pilgrimages, and to echo the author's vision that 'here if at all within the western world the skill and genius of man have found their highest expression; here the created has, by the work of his brain and hands together, produced an art of such power that it enforces belief in the Creator'.

DENIS BRASS

### ORGANIZED LIBERATION

The Catholic Emancipation Crisis in Ireland, 1823-1829. By James A. Reynolds. (Yale University Press; London, Geoffrey Cumberlege. 30s.)

So many books on Irish Catholic affairs are marred by strident special pleading or plain historical ignorance that it is really difficult to restrain one's superlatives in reviewing the present book. Here we have a work on Catholic Emancipation that is coldly impartial, that conforms to the requirements and methods of modern historical scholarship, and that is based on a wealth of documentary material a great deal of which has been brought to light by the author himself. Mr Reynolds takes as his theme the organization and development of the Catholic Association from 1823 to 1829 and he studies it as a 'pressure group', a form of extra-parliamentary activity not unknown in this country, but far more familiar in the United States.

The cynic might be inclined to think that what really frightened the English government was when the Association succeeded in keeping the Irish peasantry off the drink during election times. But there was more to it than that. The Association succeeded in canalizing all the widely varying energies and aspirations in Ireland—political, religious and near-subversive. After the confusion and disillusionment that followed the Rebellion of 1798 and the Union of 1800, the Association provided a national and disciplined movement that enabled its members to partake in a variety of political activity that undercut the administration of the ascendancy and yet remained within the law. The terms 'organization' and 'Irish' are not particularly congenial to one another. What held the Association together was the range of its appeal, its ability to be doing something, and its success in avoiding a head-on conflict with the law. Not for nothing was O'Connell a lawyer. Mr Reynolds brings out most clearly the reluctance of the English and Irish law officers to recommend prosecutions, even after Goulburn's Act.

The wealth of material that Mr Reynolds has absorbed and organized enables us to see behind the scenes of the main groups concerned -O'Connell and his lieutenants, the clergy, the Castle, and the government in London-and his judicial and judicious presentation reveals the main lines of emphasis in a very complicated sequence of events. Throughout the whole story it is clear that O'Connell was the leader, and he achieved his hold because he did not pin himself down too particularly to a single programme. Leadership was his gift, and the Catholic Association was its own raison d'être and gathered strength by its own momentum. O'Connell had none of the great insight into social and economic affairs that Bishop Doyle possessed, nor did he seem to have fully realized the far-reaching consequences of the electioneering strategy of Thomas Wise at the Waterford election-and his decision to stand at Clare was more or less a happy accident. The genius of O'Connell lay simply in keeping the Association going, and it was the Association's very existence which precipitated events.

O'Connell was the leader, not the Irish clergy; or at least, if the clergy wanted to lead, O'Connell and the Association made it necessary for them to run pretty hard to keep out in front. The existence of the Association gave the clergy the opportunity of putting themselves at the head of their flocks in an organized political movement—and if they did not, heaven help them. The Association served the power of the priests as much as the power of the priests served the Association.

Tweaking the lion's tail was good sport, and O'Connell's fulsome protestations of loyalty to the Crown make us feel really very sorry for Wellesley and Anglesey, who found the Association exploiting their well-known pro-Catholic sympathies in order to create departmental havoc within the walls of the Castle itself. By 1828 the Association had become such a power that its leaders, with a supreme disregard of logic, were able to announce that unless the government did something in the way of concession, they could not be responsible for the consequences.

Mr Reynolds tells the story of the last years of the Association extremely well, and with a wealth of detail, yet one question still remains: was the Relief Act of 1829 really a 'victory'?-who, in fact, was dishing whom? We are told (p. 164) that the restrictions contained in the Act 'were almost a dead letter'. Certainly they were, but who was to know that at the time? A third of the Bill is concerned with proposals for the gradual extermination of all the male religious Orders in the country; further, it is followed by the collateral security of the Disfranchisement Bill which eliminated precisely that part of the Irish electorate which had been the mainstay of the Association candidates at the Waterford and Clare elections. The callousness of O'Connell and his lieutenants at the fate of the forty-shilling freeholders is expressed in a group of most revealing letters among the Peel Papers in the British Museum, to which Mr Reynolds refers on p. 169. 'They do little credit,' he says, 'to the reputation of the writers for sincerity, consistency, or foresightedness.' But their course was compelled on them by the very force of circumstances which they themselves had helped to create, The Association had to stop; O'Connell wanted it to stop; but Wellington and Peel had to stop it for him-and they did so at the price of very generous concessions to Cox Hippisley and the Tory rightwingers. There was no hint of removal of the penal statutes or of any reform of the political or economic structure. To the English Radicals O'Connell was selling the pass. But he could not complain that the Relief Act was not quite what he wanted for the simple reason that he had never been very consistent about what he did want; he had to settle for what the government gave him.

But if Wellington and Peel thought they had dished O'Connell they were to be disillusioned. The point, I think, that Mr Reynolds neglects, though all his evidence points towards it, is that O'Connell was more than a great leader; he was also a great myth-historicus. A literal-minded political historian like Cobbett might look at the Relief Bill and its attendant securities and say 'It is, all taken together, a most odious measure, and there is a meanness belonging to it, which makes it perfectly disgusting' (Political Register, 29 March 1829). But it was the genius of O'Connell which persuaded the Catholic Association that this, the Relief Act of 1829, was what they had all along been striving for; that this in fact was Emancipation. And further, he succeeded in persuading the House of Commons and the English people that they had, in fact, conferred the coveted boon. Catholic Emancipation was not written into the Statute Book in 1829-it was a figment of the vivid rhetorical imagination of Daniel O'Connell. He succeeded in accomplishing a feat of national auto-suggestion, and created an historical myth which both the Irish and English peoples have accepted to this

day.

# LETTERS from HILAIRE BELLOC

Edited by Robert Speaight

Belloc was a brilliant and punctilious correspondent who left nothing to chance, wherever he was or whatever he was doing, in what he judged to be a vital link between himself and his friends. These letters cover, with one exception, the years 1900 to 1941 and into them Belloc poured his whole personality, all that vigour and zest for living that earned him the enduring devotion of his friends and made him such a redoubtable opponent in controversy. All the characteristic Belloc moods are here set down with a freedom and spontaneity that was often indicated, but never so fully expressed, in his books and articles. Unpublished verse, parodies, comments on issues of the day and of eternity, discussions of people, ideas, places, wine, books, boats-these letters of a scope that astonishes with its range and power. Among the recipients were such valued friends as Maurice Baring, G. K. Chesterton, Duff Cooper, Desmond MacCarthy, Lady Juliet Duff and Mrs Raymond Asquith. Robert Speaight, editor of these letters and author of the definitive biography of Belloc, comments that 'it is fair to say that Belloc enjoyed writing letters more than he enjoyed writing anything else. . . . They reverberate still, the undying testament of his integrity'.

30s. net

**HOLLIS & CARTER**